

to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 5413. A bill granting additional allowance for military and naval personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5414. A bill to exempt from estate tax national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 5415. A bill to amend Public Law 396, Eightieth Congress, which extends veterans' preference benefits to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen and ex-servicewomen; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 5416. A bill to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 5417. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to waive the collection of certain loans; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. R. 5418. A bill to provide for the reconstruction of the dam on Wolf Creek, Perryton, Tex., and for the repair of the Rita Blanca Dam, Dalhart, Tex.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YOUNGBLOOD:

H. R. 5419. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 5420. A bill to provide a plan for greater opportunities of employment, for distribution to management and to labor certain amounts of corporate income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. J. Res. 328. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1948, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. Con. Res. 151. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a report entitled "The Economy of Hawaii in 1947" and authorizing the printing of additional copies thereof; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. Res. 467. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation with respect to debts owed to American citizens by foreign governments, municipalities, and corporations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. Res. 468. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the widespread suffering and detrimental conditions existing among the Indians in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose legislation relating to the FEPC, antisegregation, and anti-lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 5421. A bill for the relief of the estate of James Patrick Hackett and Charles L. Stover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 5422. A bill for the relief of James Greenwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 5423. A bill for the relief of E. Neill Raymond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5424. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Silvia Mapelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 5425. A bill for the relief of the estates of Nancy Masako Arakaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5426. A bill for the relief of John Walpa Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5427. A bill for the relief of the estates of Gertrude Ornellas and Barbara June Ornellas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5428. A bill for the relief of the estate of Josephine Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5429. A bill for the relief of John Chi Chong Holt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN of New York:

H. R. 5430. A bill for the relief of the aliens Peter Lukac and his wife, Suzanne Lukac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 5431. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cleone L. Calhoun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1346. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N. Y., in protest against enactment of legislation in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Public Works.

1347. Also, concurrent resolution adopted by the Senate of New York State, memorializing Congress to amend the Federal income-tax law having to do with inequitable tax discrimination between residents of the so-called community-property States and the so-called common-law States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1348. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of citizens of Kosciusko and Jasper Counties, Ind., favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1349. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Damon Reavis, Menard, Ill., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to violation of his constitutional rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1350. Also, petition of James R. Allen, Wilmington, Del., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to complaints against Hon. Harold N. Burton, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, and others, regarding justice in the courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1351. Also, petition of A. V. Strock, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1352. Also, petition of Miami Friendship Townsend Club, No. 1, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1353. Also, petition of M. W. Clark, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1354. Also, petition of Mrs. Ida L. Bush, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1355. Also, petition of Mary Faming and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation for universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1356. Also, petition of Mrs. H. L. Briden and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to restraining production and showing of crime-producing movie films and those which contribute to juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1357. Also, petition of United American Veterans, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enacting H. R. 4528; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1358. Also, petition of James V. Jackson, South Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1359. Also, petition of Arthur E. Nelson, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1360. Also, petition of Miss Alvira Dodge, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1361. Also, petition of Mrs. M. McNaughten, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, February 2, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, save us from a worship of the lips while our hearts are far away.

In the battle now being fought in the realm of ideas, where deadly attacks are made upon our greatest treasure, our belief in God and the Gospel of Christ, deliver us from the peril of indifference, for we know that rust will crumble a metal when hammer blows will only harden it.

May this minute of prayer find each one of us, in his own way, reaching out for Thy help and guidance.

Hear our prayers and be with us this day. We ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 13, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 14, 1948, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1394) to provide increased subsistence allowances to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act

of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1454. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration, and for other purposes;

S. 1485. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands heretofore acquired for the Albuquerque Indian School, New Mexico;

S. 1507. An act authorizing the sale of undisposed-of lots in Michel addition to the town of Polson, Mont.; and

S. 1591. An act to transfer certain transmission lines, substations, appurtenances, and equipment in connection with the sale and disposition of electric energy generated at the Fort Peck project, Montana, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 522. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands of the L'Anse Band of Chippewa Indians, Michigan; and

S. 1133. An act providing for the per capita payment of certain moneys appropriated in settlement of certain claims of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2029) to provide for the free importation of synthetic-rubber scrap.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2159. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prepare plans and estimates for a sewage-disposal system to serve the Yorktown area of the Colonial National Historical Park, Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2313. An act to amend the act of May 19, 1926 (44 Stat. 565), as amended by the acts of May 14, 1935 (49 Stat. 218), and of October 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 763), providing for the detail of the United States military and naval and Air Force missions to foreign governments;

H. R. 3344. An act to amend the fourth paragraph of section 4, chapter 1, title I, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; 48 U. S. C., sec. 101), as amended;

H. R. 3603. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Snake River and its tributaries originating in either of the two States and flowing into the other;

H. R. 3936. An act to authorize the United States Park Police to make arrests within Federal reservations in the environs of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4023. An act to authorize the establishment of the De Soto National Memorial, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4461. An act approving the performance in the field of certain functions relating to the public lands;

H. R. 4513. An act to eliminate the requirement of oaths in certain land matters, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4549. An act to authorize the enactment by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska of a code of laws for Alaska;

H. R. 4823. An act to provide adequate school facilities within Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4980. An act relating to the acquisition by the United States of State-owned lands within Glacier National Park, in the State of Montana, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5035. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Eighty-second National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Grand Rapids, Mich., September 26 to 30, 1948; and

H. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the Park River Dam and Reservoir project in Walsh County, N. Dak., as the Homme Reservoir and Dam.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 422. An act for the relief of Francesco and Natalia Picchi;

H. R. 648. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfrieda Sakowsky Passant, alias Elfrieda Sakowsky, alias Elfrieda Pogue;

H. R. 650. An act for the relief of Ruston Jamsetji Patell;

H. R. 928. An act for the relief of Riyoko Patell;

H. R. 1078. An act for the relief of Mrs. Audrey Ellen Gooch;

H. R. 1408. An act for the relief of August W. Dietz;

H. R. 1650. An act for the relief of Maria Hedwig Feresz;

H. R. 1788. An act for the relief of the estate of John F. Hopperton, a minor, deceased;

H. R. 2029. An act to provide for the free importation of synthetic-rubber scrap;

H. R. 2350. An act for the relief of Mrs. Daisy Park Farrow;

H. R. 3168. An act for the relief of Antone G. Pina;

H. R. 3503. An act to permit the issuance of unrestricted deeds for town-site lands held by Alaska natives, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3778. An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25); and

H. R. 4115. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain land in the town of Cheverly, Prince Georges County, Md.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. Doc. No. 119)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revised estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 involving an increase of \$658,000 for the Federal Works Agency, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

INSTITUTE OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 5, 1947, entitled the "Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act" (Public Law 369, 80th Cong.) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting pursuant to law, re-

ports showing the names of all persons against whom claims in excess of \$1,000 have been compromised, the address of such persons, the nature of the claims, the amount of the compromises, and the reasons therefor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Social Security Administration for the fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Mediation Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the thirteenth annual report of the National Mediation Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 75 (80th Cong., 1st sess., 61 Stat. 103), I submit herewith the second quarterly report on aid to Greece and Turkey, covering the period from the inception of the program to December 31, 1947.

Since the last report submitted November 7, 1947, Greece has been subjected to ever-increasing pressure by the Communist minority, which, subservient to the foreign influences from which it draws support, would impose its will on the Greek people by force of arms. It is significant that the guerrilla warfare is directed not against the Greek Army but against the people of Greece. The deliberate and wanton destruction of Greek villages does not result from military engagements. It is determined and ruthless destruction intended to render people homeless and drive them from the soil; to force them into overcrowded urban centers where they become charges of an already overburdened state; and to create for them conditions of misery and hardship in the hope that this will make them susceptible to political agitation.

These bands which traffic in human misery and chaos are small, too small to claim any truly representative character. They total about 20,000, of which a large proportion are known to have been unwillingly impressed into the guerrilla ranks under threat of death to themselves and their families. There are Members of the United States Congress who visited Greece during the past few months who know what horrible reprisals are taken against those unwilling to fight for the Communist guerrillas.

This policy is sapping the economic strength of Greece at the same time that the American Mission for Aid to Greece is seeking to build it up through reconstruction and economic assistance. This is, of course, the intent of the guerrillas, for a healthy Greece on the road to economic recovery would not be receptive

to Communist ideology. Economic conditions in Greece have suffered from the continued military strife which has swelled the number of refugees in the north of Greece to over 420,000 and caused a greater share of the Greek national budget and of American aid funds to be spent on nonproductive undertakings. Only the most strenuous and determined efforts of the Greek Government and people will suffice to cope successfully with the present situation.

The American mission is doing all in its power to assist, and its accomplishments have been considerable. Owing to the Communist obstruction it is increasingly clear, however, that economic recovery in Greece must await the establishment of internal security. Although economic programs most effective under the circumstances will continue to be actively prosecuted, the benefits from them can be fully realized only when the warfare against the guerrillas has been successfully concluded.

To aid the Greek Government in the prosecution of the warfare against the guerrillas, the American mission at the close of the year transferred an additional \$14,000,000 of aid funds from the economic to the military program, making a total allocation to the military of about \$172,000,000. These additional funds will be used to support the formation of an additional 58 National Defense Corps battalions, making a total of 100 as requested by the Greek Government; these battalions will take over the task of protecting the villages of the provinces from which they are recruited, thereby freeing the Greek National Army to conduct a more offensive warfare. If the guerrilla menace should increase as a result of greater outside assistance, a new situation would be created which would have to be dealt with in the light of circumstances prevailing at that time.

While recent developments are adverse, in that they have lengthened the time necessary for Greece's ultimate recovery, the situation is not without encouragement. Greece is still a free country. The recent announcement of a "government" by the Communist guerrillas, who do not effectively control territory in which to exercise any of the functions of government, appears to have been an act of desperation and not of strength. The transparent device of declaring the "free government" has not materially changed the existing situation, except to reveal more clearly to the Greeks and to the world the true character of Greece's enemy. The United States Government has already made known its view that recognition of this group by other governments would have serious implications and would be clearly contrary to the principles of the United Nations Charter. The special United Nations Balkan Commission has passed a resolution that in its view any such recognition would constitute a threat to the peace.

I am pleased to be able to report that the Turkish aid program is proceeding in an orderly manner. Careful planning and procurement are now resulting in deliveries which can be expected to flow at a fairly uniform rate.

Continued economic assistance to Greece will be provided under the Euro-

pean recovery program, if that program is authorized by the Congress. The European recovery program will not provide, however, for any additional military assistance required for Greece and Turkey, which will, at the appropriate time, be sought from the Congress under Public Law 75.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 16, 1948.

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 16, 1948.

NOTE.—The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.

REPORT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF PANAMA RAILROAD CO.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Ninety-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Company for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 17, 1948.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A petition of the Miami Townsend Club, No. 22, Miami, Fla., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a uniform national pension system; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to make a larger apportionment of Federal funds available for the immediate construction of an adequate farm-to-market road program

"Whereas the rural residents of South Carolina are badly handicapped and inconvenienced because of the lack of adequate paved farm-to-market roads; and

"Whereas such lack of all-weather roads is proving costly to our farmers economically and socially; and

"Whereas the system of Federal-aid roads has reached a much more satisfactory stage of completion than that of the farm-to-market system and is much more adequately sufficient; and

"Whereas at this crucial time of necessity for ample farm production, every reasonable

facility should be furnished to help our farmers: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the South Carolina delegation in Congress be requested to urge a larger apportionment of Federal funds for the immediate construction of an adequate farm-to-market road program; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded immediately to the Members of Congress from South Carolina."

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES RELATING TO CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a resolution adopted February 12 by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the Congress of the United States to seriously consider and oppose national legislation relating to the FEPC, antisegregation, and anti-lynching legislation, so as to continue to vest these important matters solely under the jurisdiction of the States.

I find the observations and expressions contained in this resolution in close parallel with my own thinking on such subjects and at this time I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing the National Congress of the United States to seriously consider and oppose national legislation relating to the FEPC antisegregation and anti-lynching legislation, so as to continue to vest these important matters solely under the jurisdiction of the States

Whereas there is certain proposed legislation pending before the United States Congress, or probably soon to be so pending; and Whereas such proposed legislation is in the form of the Fair Employment Practices Act, proposed antisegregation legislation; and

Whereas the enactment of such proposed legislation will strike at the fundamental constitutional principles that a State shall prescribe all remedies and all forums for the adjudication of all matters not granted under the United States Constitution to the Federal Government by the people of the various States; and

Whereas the very first and last steps in a would-be police or totalitarian state is to strip the constituent elements of such state of all powers and to place unwarrantedly such powers in the hands of a strong federal government; and

Whereas the enactment of such proposed legislation into Federal laws further concentrates unwarranted powers in the Federal Government; and

Whereas such course is dangerous for the very reason that such will eventually destroy the jurisdiction, powers, and authority of the various States, and therefore the people; and

Whereas further, it is the minorities in a police or totalitarian state who suffer the most, due to the fact that constituent political elements thereof, or constituent republics thereof, have been stripped of all power; and

Whereas it is felt that the various States of the American Union can far better pass laws that would be much more beneficial to its people in regard to the proposed legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That the proposed legislation above referred to is not only sectional in its purpose

but that the enactment of such into law will not only be inimical to the South but to the Nation as a whole.

That such proposed legislation is unconstitutional and un-American in that it would give to making the Federal Government all powerful and would destroy the checks and balances of the people, which they have, and which are necessary for them to have, in order to prevent a too powerful bureaucratic government from undermining the fundamental principles of Americanism.

That the enactment of such legislation into law when carried to its logical conclusion will destroy the rights and privileges of the minorities of this land, so that those who now clamor for the passage of such legislation will no doubt be its victims tomorrow.

That any bill or bills providing for the enactment of such proposed legislation be killed in the outset in order that we might not gamble with the future of America.

That a copy of this resolution be directed to the following: The President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the two United States Senators from South Carolina, to the six Representatives in the United States Congress from South Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

COLUMBIA, S. C., February 12, 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Robert L. Hague Merchant Marine Industries Post, No. 1242, of the American Legion, Department of New York, in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas the American Legion at its twenty-ninth annual national convention, held in the city of New York, N. Y., on the 31st day of August 1947, adopted a policy calling for positive and aggressive action by the American Legion in support of a strong American merchant marine; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States now has before it legislation giving approval to an agreement with Canada relating to the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

"Whereas it has been fully demonstrated that construction of said seaway as presently planned would not permit its use by the overwhelming majority of vessels in the American merchant marine; and

"Whereas construction of such seaway would be in the nature of a direct grant of aid to the operators of shallow-draft, foreign-flag vessels in competition with the American merchant marine: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Robert L. Hague Merchant Marine Industries Post, No. 1242, of the American Legion, Department of New York, is opposed to the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States are hereby urged to refuse to give congressional approval to the agreement relative to construction of said project."

Adopted at a regular meeting of the Robert L. Hague Merchant Marine Industries Post,

No. 1242, of the American Legion, Department of New York, held on the 20th day of January 1948.

EDWARD C. HOLDEN, Jr.,
Commander.
WILLIAM SCHWARTZ,
Adjutant.

WORLD AIR COMMERCE DAY—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF MIAMI (FLA.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Miami (Fla.) Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas World Trade Week (May 17-22, 1948) will bring the businessmen of the world into conferences, throughout this and other nations, on mutual problems; and

Whereas the greatest aids to world peace and international good will are improved communications and increased trade relations between the nations of the world; and

Whereas Maritime Day, long established to honor men, ships, and the great part the merchant fleets of the world have played and are playing to facilitate world commerce and trade, is a definite part of World Trade Week; and

Whereas no day has been set aside on a national scale to focus public attention on air transportation, the most rapidly growing mode of shipping cargo and carrying passengers; and

Whereas the problems pertaining to both air and sea commerce are related in so many respects and the scope of a national Air Commerce Day would overlap Maritime Day to an extent which makes it obvious that the 2 days should be observed within the period of a single week: Be it therefore

Resolved, That a World Air Commerce Day should be declared nationally as a feature of World Trade Week and every effort be made to bring the focus of world attention on the present growth and potentially unlimited possibilities of future air-passenger service and on air carriers as movers of the world's goods; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to designate a World Air Commerce Day to be observed each year 3 days from Maritime Day, either before or after, depending upon the day of World Trade Week on which Maritime Day occurs.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, MIAMI
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

FEBRUARY 2, 1948.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2123. A bill to exempt certain officers of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force from the provisions of statutes requiring retirement by reason of age, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 889).

By Mr. GURNEY (for Mr. HILL), from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1525. A bill to provide for furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 890).

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1807. A bill to provide for the temporary extension of the Export Control Act and title III of the Second War Powers Act; with amendments (Rept. No. 891).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY SPECIAL SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report an original resolution. The resolution merely authorizes the appropriation of an additional \$15,000 to be expended by the Small Business Committee. The report is signed by all the members of the Rules and Administration Committee who are in Washington at the present time, and it was unanimously adopted by the committee. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of what the resolution proposes to do.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Special Committee to Study the Problems of American Small Business will expire on April 1 next. Some additional duties have been imposed upon the committee, in the matter of obtaining steel for small business and other enterprises. The committee has exhausted its funds. Just before the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHEAT], the chairman of the committee, left Washington, he explained to me that it was necessary to have the additional amount authorized by the resolution which has been reported by the Senator from Illinois. The question of the extension of the life of the committee is not at all involved. That is a matter which Congress will have to consider later, because the life of the committee will not expire until the first of April, as I have said. The resolution which has been submitted will provide money for the time between this date and April 1 only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 200) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Special Committee to Study the Problems of American Small Business Enterprises, created by Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 24, 1947, and extended by Senate Resolution 153, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947, is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate \$15,000 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for the same purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. BARKLEY introduced Senate bill 2165, to promote the development and conservation of certain resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores

of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 2166. A bill for the relief of Terez Hagymasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2167. A bill relating to the promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 2168, authorizing the appropriation of \$1,000,000,000 for the purposes of rural electrification, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 2169. A bill for the relief of Anna Halberstam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2170. A bill for the relief of Augustyn Mystokowski and Janina Ludwika Mystokowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK (by request):

S. 2171. A bill to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. PEPPER introduced Senate bill 2172, to extend the maturity for mortgages under the National Housing Act in the case of property owned by veterans of World War II, to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase home loans guaranteed or insured under the provisions of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. O'DANIEL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. CAIN):

S. 2173. A bill to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreements and orders; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2174. A bill to amend further sections 10 and 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended (37 U. S. C. 110 and 112), relating to allowances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. 2175. A bill for the relief of Gabe Budwee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 2176. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Allen Old Horn, Sr.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

S. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1948, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution to prohibit the use of grains for the manufacture of intoxicating liquor for 1 year, or until October 15, 1948, as may be determined by the President and the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION OF CERTAIN RESOURCES IN SUBMERGED COASTAL LANDS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to promote the development and conservation of certain

resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States, and I request that a letter of transmittal from the Attorney General to the President of the Senate, together with a statement explaining the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from Kentucky will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter and explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2165) to promote the development and conservation of certain resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States, introduced by Mr. BARKLEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

There being no objection, the letter and explanatory statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,

Washington, D. C., February 6, 1948.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,

President pro tempore,

United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "to promote the development and conservation of certain resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States."

This proposed bill was drafted jointly by the Department of the Interior, the Department of Justice, and the National Military Establishment.

There is attached to the proposed bill an explanatory statement which summarizes and discusses its provisions in detail.

We recommend that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and that it be enacted promptly.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed bill to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL,

Secretary of Defense.

TOM C. CLARK,

Attorney General.

J. A. KRUG,

Secretary of the Interior.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT CONCERNING A PROPOSED BILL TO PROMOTE THE DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION OF CERTAIN RESOURCES IN THE SUBMERGED COASTAL LANDS ADJACENT TO THE SHORES OF THE UNITED STATES

On June 23, 1947, by its decision in *United States v. California* (332 U. S. (preliminary print) 19) the Supreme Court settled an important question which for more than a decade had been the subject of controversy. The issue in the case was whether the United States or California had paramount rights in and power over the submerged lands of the 3-mile marginal belt off the coast of California, including the authority to exploit or authorize the exploitation of the resources of such lands. The Court decided "that California is not the owner of the 3-mile marginal belt along its coast, and that the Federal Government rather than the State has paramount rights in and power over that belt, an incident to which is full dominion over the resources of the soil under that water area, including oil" (332 U. S. 38-39). On October 27, 1947, the Court entered a decree which adjudged that:

"1. The United States of America is now, and has been at all times pertinent hereto,

possessed of paramount rights in, and full dominion and power over, the lands, minerals, and other things underlying the Pacific Ocean lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of California, and outside of the inland waters, extending seaward three nautical miles and bounded on the north and south, respectively, by the northern and southern boundaries of the State of California. The State of California has no title thereto or property interest therein.

"2. The United States is entitled to the injunctive relief prayed for in the complaint.

"3. Jurisdiction is reserved by this Court to enter such further orders and to issue such writs as may from time to time be deemed advisable or necessary to give full force and effect to this decree."

The basic reasons for the Court's decision were that the acquisition of the 3-mile belt has been accomplished by the National Government and that the "protection and control of it has been and is a function of national external sovereignty" (332 U. S. 34). These reasons obviously are not limited in their application to the submerged lands adjacent to the coast of California.

Moreover, while the California case only involved the 3-mile belt, there is no reason to believe that the Court's conclusion would be any different with respect to the resources of any area beyond the 3-mile limit to which the National Government may have extended its jurisdiction. Such an extension of jurisdiction was accomplished by the proclamation of September 28, 1945, which declared that the United States "regards the natural resources of the subsoil and sea bed of the continental shelf beneath the high seas but contiguous to the coasts of the United States as appertaining to the United States, subject to its jurisdiction and control * * *." (Executive Proclamation 2667, September 28, 1945, 10 FR 12303.) Indeed, this action of the President was assimilated by the Court in *United States v. California* to previous declarations concerning national jurisdiction within the 3-mile belt (332 U. S. 33, 34, fn. 18).

Petroleum is vital to our national security and important in our national economy. Within the 3-mile belt off our coast large quantities of oil and gas have been and are being produced, and more are believed to exist in the continental shelf beyond that belt. Most of the oil and gas now being produced within these areas is in fields that are being drained by wells on land not owned by the Federal Government. It is therefore highly desirable that the Congress promptly make provision for the conservation and development of oil and gas in the coastal areas below low tide and outside the inland waters of any State. In addition, some equitable relief should be extended to the States and their political subdivisions, grantees, and lessees because of actions with respect to oil and gas taken by them prior to the Court's decision in *United States v. California* and on the assumption that the States owned the oil and gas deposits in these areas.

The enclosed draft of bill is designed to meet these needs. There follows an analysis and discussion of its significant provisions.

1. Section 2 (b) defines the term "submerged coastal lands," and thus the areas covered by the bill, as including two categories of submerged lands. The first is "submerged lands seaward of the shores of the United States and Alaska which are under the dominion of, and subject to the paramount rights of, the United States * * *." This language paraphrases that used by the Court in the *California Case* (332 U. S. 38, 39). It is intended to be descriptive of the marginal belt off the coast of California, which was the subject matter of that case, and also of such other marginal belt areas

off the coasts of the United States and Alaska as involve no facts which might call for a different conclusion than that reached by the Court in deciding the California case. The marginal belt areas thus described are, of course, outside the inland waters of the States, which include ports, harbors, bays, rivers, and lakes. As to such inland water areas, the Federal Government has asserted no claim (332 U. S. 25, 26).

The second category of areas covered by the bill is "all other submerged lands of the entire continental shelf seaward of such shores [of the United States and Alaska], within which submerged lands the natural resources appertain to the United States and are subject to its jurisdiction and control, but which resources are not owned by any State or other person * * *." This language paraphrases that used by the President in the proclamation of September 28, 1945. It is intended to characterize the continental shelf areas which are within the scope of that proclamation and which are beyond the seaward boundaries of the marginal belt described in the first category. The phrase "but which resources are not owned by any State or other person" has been added in order to exclude any lands under the inland waters of the States which may form portions of the continental shelf. The words "or other person" identify any grantee of such an area from a State.

2. Section 3 (a) provides that the oil and gas deposits in submerged coastal lands shall be subject to disposal only in accordance with the provisions of the proposed bill. It further provides that "no rights in or claims to such deposits, whether based upon applications filed or other action taken heretofore or hereafter, shall be recognized except in accordance with the provisions of this act." The quoted language is intended to bar any conceivable claims to obtain, without compliance with the terms of the bill, permits or leases of these oil and gas deposits that may be asserted by persons who have heretofore filed applications for such permits or leases with the Department of the Interior. These applications were purportedly filed under the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, either as originally enacted or as amended (41 Stat. 437, 30 U. S. C. sec. 181 et seq.). Commencing in 1937, the applications were suspended pending a determination of the nature and extent of the rights of the Federal Government in the submerged coastal lands.

After the Supreme Court decision in the California case, the question whether the Mineral Leasing Act applied to these areas became material. On August 8 and 28, 1947, the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior and the Attorney General, respectively, held that the act did not apply to the submerged coastal areas. Accordingly, on September 8, 1947, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management denied the applications pending in that Bureau, and on October 6, 1947, the Secretary of the Interior denied the applications pending in his office.

There is no reason to think that the legal conclusions of the Solicitor and the Attorney General, and the consequent administrative actions denying all the then pending applications, can be successfully challenged in the courts. But regardless of this assumption, no substantial equity appears which would justify giving any of these applications preferential consideration in the issuance of oil or gas leases or otherwise treating them as valid. Moreover, a substantial number of them involve producing oil and gas areas developed by lessees of California at great expense and under circumstances, which, as hereafter discussed, may justify the issuance of exchange leases, in accordance with the procedures set forth in the proposed bill, to the holders of the State leases.

3. Other portions of section 3 point up the major premise of the proposed legislation, that is, the vital relationship of the petroleum in the submerged coastal areas to our national security. Thus, subsection (b) declares the policy of the Congress to be that the petroleum resources of these areas shall, to the maximum extent consistent with the needs of the national economy, "be conserved as a national asset vital to the security of the Nation," and requires all administrative action under the bill to conform to that policy. A continuing implementation of the same policy is provided for by subsection (c), which declares that the provisions of the bill shall also be administered in accordance "with such determinations as to national security, conservation, or development," in furtherance of the policy declared in subsection (b), as may be made from time to time by the President. The President is authorized by subsection (d) to withdraw from disposition any of the submerged coastal lands and reserve them for the use of the United States in the interest of national security, thus making provision for the husbanding of petroleum underground for future military use.

Finally, subsection (e) of section 3 gives the United States in time of war, or when the President shall so prescribe, the right of first refusal to purchase at the market price all or any portion of the oil and gas produced from the submerged lands. This would, in effect, give the Government a continuing option at a fair price, ahead of any other possible purchasers.

4. Sections 4, 5, and 6 authorize the Secretary of the Interior in his discretion to grant oil and gas leases of submerged coastal lands. Of course, such leases may not be granted with respect to lands reserved by the President in the interest of national security under section 3 (d), nor may they be granted without the approval of the Secretary of Defense with respect to lands designated by the latter as needed for navigation purposes or for national defense under section 14. Sections 4, 5, and 6 and other portions of the bill have been drafted along lines similar to those of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U. S. C. sec. 181 et seq.), but are different in a number of respects because water areas are involved or because of considerations of national security.

Section 4 relates to the leasing of submerged coastal lands which are not within any known geological structure of a producing oil and gas field, and section 5 relates to lands within such a structure. In both cases, the leases are to be issued after competitive bidding to the responsible person bidding the highest bonus. With respect to lands not within a structure, this represents a departure from the Mineral Leasing Act, which provides for the issuance of a lease to the first qualified applicant. (30 U. S. C. sec. 226.) It is felt that such a departure is justified because bona fide operation in the submerged land areas is much more expensive than on dry land, and competitive bidding will discourage the purely speculative operator who does not really intend to develop the land.

Section 4 provides that the area of a lease of land not within a known geological structure of a producing field shall not exceed 64,000 acres at the time of the issuance of the lease. However, within 3 years thereafter, the area must be reduced to not more than one-half of the original area or 7,680 acres, whichever is larger. Before the end of the fifth lease year, the area must be reduced to not more than 7,680 acres. Section 5 provides that the area of a lease of land within a known geological structure shall not exceed 2,560 acres. The only comparable provision of the Mineral Leasing Act limits the

acreage of a leasing unit on a known structure to 640 acres (30 U. S. C. sec. 226), while the regulations under that act fix a limitation of 2,560 acres on any lease of land not within a structure. (43 CFR 192.40.) Section 6 of the bill provides an over-all acreage limitation on leases held by any one party of 128,000 acres (of which not more than 30,720 acres may be held under producing leases) in any one of the following coastal regions: The Pacific Ocean or the Gulf of Mexico or the Atlantic Ocean. Under the Mineral Leasing Act, the over-all limitation on leases is 15,360 acres in any one State, and on options taken for exploration purposes is 100,000 acres in any one State. (30 U. S. C. sec. 184.)

The acreage limitation provisions of the bill are to some extent more generous than those under the Mineral Leasing Act. The reasons for this are that exploration and development in water areas are more costly and complex than on dry land, and that, unless such greater acreage is permitted, exploration and development will be retarded. It should be made clear, however, that the acreage limitations with respect to the size of individual leases are merely ceilings, and that in the issuance of leases the Secretary is required by the bill to exercise discretion in fixing the acreage as well as in prescribing the shape and dimensions of the land involved, and is also directed to insist on reasonable compactness. Under the Mineral Leasing Act, though the acreage permitted to be included in any one leasing unit on a structure is 640 acres, the Department of the Interior has followed the general practice of offering tracts for bidding in units of 160 acres or less.

The term of leases issued under sections 4 and 5 of the bill is to be 5 years and so long thereafter as there is production in paying quantities. At the end of that 5 years, in the absence of such production, off-structure leases are to receive an extension of not more than 5 years, upon proof of the performance of "actual development work" costing at least \$75,000, or such greater amount as the Secretary may fix at or before the granting of the lease. "Actual development work," as referred to in this clause of section 4, does not include any geophysical or geological exploration activities. The provision for expenditure of at least \$75,000 should discourage delays in development, while at the same time protecting the lessee who, though proceeding with reasonable speed, is unable to obtain production in paying quantities before the end of 5 years because of conditions peculiar to submerged-land development. For similar reasons, section 5 provides for a 2-year extension of structure leases if, at the end of the primary 5-year term, there is no production in paying quantities but drilling operations commenced not less than 90 days prior thereto have been and are being diligently prosecuted.

According to section 4, until there is a discovery, off-structure lessees are to pay a rental of 25 cents per acre per annum for the fourth lease year and not less than 50 cents per annum for every lease year thereafter. The Mineral Leasing Act fixes an annual rental of not less than 25 cents per acre for every lease year except the second and third (30 U. S. C., sec. 226). The provisions of the bill are designed to give the lessee the lighter burden during the early years when he should be spending all he can on development under difficult water conditions. Moreover, under the bill the lessee will have paid a bonus in competing for the lease, which is not the case under the Mineral Leasing Act.

With respect to both structure and off-structure leases, the royalty to be paid is not less than 12½ percent of the amount or

value of the oil or gas produced. In the case of off-structure leases, the bill requires payment of a minimum royalty of not less than \$1 per acre per annum, after discovery, in lieu of rental. Under the Mineral Leasing Act, the royalty rate on off-structure leases is fixed at 12½ percent and on-structure leases at not less than 12½ percent (30 U. S. C., sec. 226). The 12½ percent is made a minimum (rather than fixed at that rate) for off-structure leases under the bill so as to permit the exercise of discretion by the Secretary in the light, among other things, of the royalty rates heretofore charged by the States in the submerged-land areas.

5. The bill's major theme of national defense and the public welfare is again reflected in subsections (f) and (g) of section 6 and in section 14. Subsection (f) of section 6 gives the Secretary of the Interior the power to regulate the rate of prospecting and development by lessees and the quantity and rate of production from leases, in the interest of national defense or the public welfare. Under this provision, the Secretary could, when clearly justified in the national interest, fix such rates without strict regard for conservation or engineering practices. Moreover, this power of the Secretary is additional to those he has under the provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act, incorporated by reference in section 13 of the bill. These provisions deal with, among other things, the prevention of waste; the exercise of reasonable diligence, skill, and care in operations; and, in the case of unitization, the rates of prospecting and development and quantity and rate of production. (Secs. 16, 17 (b), and 30 of the Mineral Leasing Act; 30 U. S. C. secs. 225, 226 (e), 187.)

Subsection (g) of section 6 will permit the Secretary of the Interior, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, during a state of war or national emergency declared by the Congress or the President after the effective date of the bill, to suspend operations or terminate any lease issued under the bill. This provision is intended to facilitate, during periods of national military or similar urgency, the complete control by the Federal Government of a resource essential to the national defense and of coastal areas strategically important from a defense standpoint. However, while each lease must be taken subject to the exercise of this right of suspension and termination, any lessee adversely affected by the exercise of the right should receive reasonable compensation. The development of submerged lands involves the expenditure of large sums of money. Unless some provision for compensation is made, operators will quite likely refuse to take leases and necessary development will be retarded. With this in mind, subsection (g) requires all leases to contain a provision for payment to the lessee whose operations are thus terminated or suspended of an amount determined in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary which may incorporate guiding equitable principles.

Under section 14, the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the President, may designate as restricted those areas needed for navigation purposes or for national defense, and while so designated no exploration is to be conducted on, and no lease issued for, any part of these areas except with the approval of the Secretary of Defense. This provision was drafted in order to make possible the maximum freedom of defense activities in the coastal waters, as well as to avoid undesirable obstructions to navigation generally.

6. In sections 7 to 10, the bill deals with the problem of relief to the coastal States, their political subdivisions and grantees and those holding oil and gas leases from them, that prior to the Supreme Court's decision of June 23, 1947, acted on the assumption that

the submerged coastal lands belonged to the States. The relief provided by the bill is of two kinds. One is directed to the continuation of operations by persons who presently are operating under State oil and gas leases, and the other relates to the waiving of liability for past trespasses.

Oil was discovered on the California coast at the beginning of the century. (332 U. S. 30.) While there was some production in the submerged lands off that coast prior to 1921, production under leases issued by the State did not start until 1922, after the passage of a State leasing act. (Cal. Stats., 1921, Chap. 303, p. 404.) When the Supreme Court decision was handed down in 1947, there were 78 producing oil and gas leases on tidal and submerged lands which had been issued by California, with a monthly production of about 1,000,000 barrels of oil. It is estimated that the total withdrawal of oil from the tidal and submerged lands off the California coast prior to the date of the decision has amounted to more than 150,000,000 barrels. To a considerably lesser extent than on the California coast, there has been oil and gas development in the Gulf of Mexico, which began under State leasing acts some 10 years ago. It is estimated that the total withdrawal of oil from the Gulf areas prior to June 1947 amounted to less than 10,000,000 barrels.

The Supreme Court in the California case said that "the record plainly demonstrates that until the California oil issue began to be pressed in the thirties, neither the States nor the Government had reason to focus attention on the question of which of them owned or had paramount rights in or power over the 3-mile belt." (332 U. S. 39.) On August 19, 1937, the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 208 directing the Attorney General to assert, maintain, and establish Federal ownership of the 3-mile belt and its petroleum deposits along our entire coast, but the House of Representatives did not act on the resolution, though its Judiciary Committee held hearings on the matter and reported favorably on the substance of the resolution. (See Hearings, House Judiciary Committee, 75th Cong., 3d sess., on S. J. Res. 208, February 23-25, 1938; H. Rept. No. 2378, Judiciary Committee, 75th Cong., 3d sess., on S. J. Res. 208, May 19, 1938.) In the Seventy-sixth Congress, similar legislation was considered, but no action was taken by either house. (See Hearings, Subcommittee No. 4, House Judiciary Committee, 76th Cong., 1st sess., on H. J. Res. 176 and H. J. Res. 181, March 22, 23, 1939; Hearings, Senate Public Lands Committee, 76th Cong., 1st sess., on S. J. Res. 83 and S. J. Res. 92, March 27-30, 1939.) In the Seventy-ninth Congress, hearings were held by the Judiciary Committees of both Houses on a number of substantially identical resolutions quitclaiming Federal title in these areas to the States. (See Joint Hearings, 79th Cong., 1st sess., on H. J. Res. 118 et al., June 18-20, 1945; Hearings, Senate Judiciary Committee, 79th Cong., 2d sess., on S. J. Res. 48 and H. J. Res. 225, February 5-7, 1946.) These committees both reported favorably on one of these measures, House Joint Resolution 225, venturing the opinion that the States owned the submerged coastal lands, with their oil and gas resources, and that the Supreme Court had so held. (See H. Rept. No. 927, Judiciary Committee, 79th Cong., 1st sess., on H. J. Res. 225, July 17, 1945; S. Rept. No. 1260, Judiciary Committee, 79th Cong., 2d sess., on H. J. Res. 225, April 26, 1946.) The resolution passed both Houses, but the President vetoed it on August 1, 1946, and his veto was not overridden. The President's reasons were that the question of ownership was a legal one which should be determined by the Supreme Court in the California case, which had been commenced and was then pending; that the issue had not theretofore been deter-

mined; and that if "the United States owns these areas, they should not be given away." (See Veto Message, H. Doc. 765, 79th Cong., 2d sess.)

On May 29, 1945, the Attorney General filed a suit, entitled "*United States v. Pacific Western Oil Company*" in the United States district court, at Los Angeles, in an effort to settle the question of ownership. But, in order to expedite a determination, he dismissed that suit, and on October 19, 1945, commenced the original action against California in the Supreme Court, which culminated in the Court's decision of June 23, 1947, favorable to the United States. In that action, the Government took the position (brief, p. 70), and the Court in its opinion agreed (332 U. S. 36, 37, 38), that the case judicially raised the question of Federal versus State ownership for the first time.

As the foregoing references illustrate, it is clear that prior to the decision by the Supreme Court, no one could really be certain that the Federal Government owned the submerged coastal areas and their petroleum deposits. The States assumed that they were the owners, acted on that assumption, enacted legislation authorizing the issuance of oil and gas leases, and actually issued such leases.

In his oral argument of the California case in the Supreme Court, the Attorney General said:

"We will recommend to the Congress that legislation be enacted designed to relieve California and those who have operated under State authority, from the necessity of accounting to the United States for revenues derived in the past from the exploitation of any of the lands here involved. Such legislation, in the view of the President, should also establish equitable standards for the recognition of investments made by private interests and should offer a basis for the continued operation of private establishments wherever consistent with the national interest, and on terms which would be fair and just under all circumstances."

And in the supplemental brief for the United States in that case, it was said:

"In this connection it is pertinent to note, as stated by the Attorney General at oral argument, that the President had authorized him to say that there is no desire on the part of the President or of any Federal official to destroy or confiscate any honest or bona fide investment, or to deprive the State or its subdivisions of any reasonable expectation of return from the areas that have been developed."

"The President recognizes that in the event the decision of this Court is favorable to the United States, it will be necessary to have congressional action looking toward the future management of the resources of this area. And he also intends to recommend to the Congress that legislation be enacted recognizing both prospectively and retrospectively, any equities of the State and those who have operated under it, to the fullest extent consistent with the national interest."

Sections 7 to 10 of the proposed bill were drafted in the light of the foregoing assurances. Sections 7 to 9 make provision for the issuance of leases by the Federal Government in exchange for oil and gas leases issued prior to June 23, 1947, by any State or its political subdivision or grantee and covering submerged coastal lands. The Secretary of the Interior is directed (not merely authorized) to issue such a lease upon the favorable determination of a commission to be known as the Submerged Coastal Lands Commission. Its three members are to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice of the Senate. The Commission is to determine whether the national interest would be served by the issuance of an ex-

change lease, whether the holder of the old lease is equitably entitled to receive an exchange lease, and the terms and conditions under which the latter may be issued. Eight standards are enumerated which are, among other things, to guide the Commission in making its determinations. These standards are believed to be relevant to the national interest and the equities of the applicants. Each exchange lease is to be for a period not exceeding the unexpired portion of the term of the old lease; is to cover, in whole or in part, the same area of submerged coastal lands as was covered by the old lease; and is to provide for not less than the rentals, royalties, and other payments provided for in the old lease.

Section 7 also provides that if the Commission determines against the issuance of an exchange lease, but believes that in fairness the applicant should receive a sum of money, it shall so report to the Secretary, who is to submit its report to the Congress for consideration. This provision would, for example, cover a case where the Commission considers that issuance of a lease would be against the national interest, but finds that the applicant has substantial equities. In such cases the Congress will be the final judge of whether, and how much, compensation should be paid.

Section 8 sets out certain conditions with which there must be compliance before an exchange lease can be issued. One of them is that an application for such a lease must be filed within 6 months from the date of the Commission's first meeting. Some time limitation for filing is desirable in order to make possible the determination of the status of the lands, and the oil and gas operations on them, as soon as the circumstances permit. Otherwise the leasing and oil and gas development of the lands would be indefinitely delayed and retarded. However, while the actions so far taken by the Supreme Court in the California case definitely establish a rule of law, the actual seaward limits of the inland coastal waters of California and the actual low-tide lines along its coast, which, together, constitute the landward boundary of the 3-mile marginal belt, have not yet been fixed. Moreover, for similar reasons, this is also true of the Gulf of Mexico. Hence, at the end of the 6-month period for filing applications the question of whether particular tracts of land are within or without the marginal belt may still be unresolved, and may remain so for some time. To meet this situation, section 8 also provides that upon a satisfactory showing of substantial doubt as to whether an area constitutes submerged coastal lands within the meaning of the bill the Submerged Coastal Lands Commission may, from time to time, extend the period for the filing of applications upon the request of any party in interest made within the 6 months or any extension of the basic period previously granted by the Commission.

Another requirement of section 8 is that each applicant for an exchange lease must state in his application that the lease applied for shall be subject to the same "overriding royalty obligations as the old lease. Overriding royalty obligations are those owed by an oil and gas lessee to persons other than the owner of the land. They are created by the lessee, sometimes when he assigns his lease and reserves such a royalty, and sometimes when, while retaining his lease, he grants such a royalty in order to obtain capital. They represent substantial property interests. If the commission decides that an exchange lease should be issued, it is felt that the applicant should in fairness to these royalty owners continue to honor the same obligations with respect to the new lease as existed with respect to the old one.

Because the determination of whether exchange leases should be issued may be delayed for substantial periods of time and

because producing areas are involved, section 9 authorizes any lessee from a State or its political subdivision or grantee to continue operations on a provisional basis pending the issuance of exchange leases, provided an application in accordance with section 8 is timely filed. The section also provides for the making of interim arrangements by the Secretary of the Interior with the old lessors and their lessees covering the management, operation, and control of oil and gas wells during the intervening period.

Section 10 would have the effect of releasing any State, its political subdivisions or grantees, and those holding leases from them, from liability for trespasses committed in producing oil or gas from any submerged coastal lands prior to June 23, 1947, the date of the decision in the California case, and from liability to account to the United States for oil or gas theretofore extracted from these lands, or for moneys received under such leases. However, because uncertainty about the question of paramount rights and control was resolved by the decision, it is provided that any State, and its political subdivisions or grantees, shall be required to account to the United States for rentals, royalties, and other sums received after the decision under any such leases.

7. Following the precedent established by section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U. S. C., sec. 191), section 11 of the bill provides for payment of substantial portions of the gross income derived by the Federal Government from oil and gas operations in the submerged coastal lands to the States where this income is produced, and to the reclamation fund created by the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388, 43 U. S. C., sec. 391 et seq.). Each State is to receive 37½ percent of all such income from activities within the boundaries of that State and within the 3-mile marginal belt. This money is to be available for the construction and maintenance of public roads or public parks or for the support of public schools or other public educational institutions, as the legislature of the State may direct. The reclamation fund is to receive 52½ percent of all such income from activities within the boundaries of any of the States to which the Reclamation Act, as amended or supplemented, is or may become applicable and within the 3-mile marginal belt.

8. The rest of the bill adopts the substance of, or incorporates by reference, various provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act.

VETERANS' HOUSING LOANS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill which proposes to make two very salutary changes in the present law relative to the subject of veterans' housing. I know the great interest of the distinguished Senator from Washington, presently occupying the chair, in this subject. Under the present law unhappily the RFC can no longer guarantee veterans' housing loans 100 percent. It in my opinion is absolutely necessary, if the veterans are going to be able to get access to adequate housing, that what some call the second mortgage, that part of the veterans' housing loan which is guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration, be purchasable by some public authority. I am told that we are threatened with a crisis in housing because the insurance companies and others who ordinarily purchase housing paper are desisting from such purchase, to see if Congress will not raise the interest rate to 4½

percent instead of 4 percent as under the law at the present time. I am also told that the whole housing program, at least the veterans' part of it, is threatened with coming to a standstill and with paralysis unless the Congress either raises the interest rate to 4½ percent and thereby adds to the burden of cost that the veteran must bear, or restores to the RFC the power to take this paper at 100-percent valuation. If we do the latter, I think it is possible we may escape the necessity of raising the interest rate, but I venture to say we must do one or the other. We must either raise the interest rate to 4½ percent, so that private purchasers will purchase the paper, or we must put the Government again in possession of the power it formerly had and wisely exercised of purchasing this paper, and make it possible for a veteran to secure a home by paying a very small amount as a condition precedent to doing so. My bill, which I have just sent to the desk, proposes to restore to the RFC the power that it formerly had and which the Congress took away, to purchase the paper guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration, as well as FHA paper, which it can now purchase at 100-percent valuation. Secondly, it proposes to extend the period of amortization on veterans' housing loans from the present 25 years to 32 years. That obviously will lower the monthly payment which the veteran will be required to make and will ease the burden that he will have to bear.

Not only that, Mr. President, but my bill makes these salutary benefits, should they be provided by the Congress, effective from the 1st of February of this year. I feel that there is a real crisis in the veterans housing field, and I hope that the bill will make some contribution to its speedy solution. I commend it to those who have been so interested as the able Senator from Washington has been in this whole housing program for veterans.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2172) to extend the maturity for mortgages under the National Housing Act in the case of property owned by veterans of World War II, to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase home loans guaranteed or insured under the provisions of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PEPPER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that certain testimony which I gave on this subject in behalf of amendments to the Wolcott bill, which were similar to what I have offered in the present bill, may appear in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTES FOR SENATOR PEPPER ON S. 287, MORTGAGE INSURANCE (VETERANS)

I. LEGISLATION

Federal home-loan bank operations

Under the present law, the Federal home-loan banks cannot accept as collateral for

their advances home-mortgage loans with more than 20 years maturity. Section 503 (b) of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill would encourage and facilitate the making of home loans with longer than 20-year maturities by member institutions (such as building and loan associations) by authorizing the Federal home-loan banks to make advances to such members on home-mortgage loans with maturities of up to 25 years as contrasted with the present limitation of 20 years.

Federal Housing Administration operations

Under section 203 of the National Housing Act the maximum maturity of home-mortgage loans insured thereunder on new construction is limited to 20 years, except in the case of newly constructed, single-family, owner-occupied homes costing \$6,000 or less where the maximum maturity may be 25 years. Loans are up to 90 percent of value of house. The maximum statutory interest rate is 5 percent, but this has been reduced to 4½ percent in actual practice.

Section 508 (a) of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill would raise the 20-year-maximum maturity to 25 years. Under section 602 of the bill a maximum maturity up to 30 years on insured homes costing not more than about \$5,260 would be authorized on newly constructed single-family, owner-occupied homes at 4 percent per annum for low-income families. Under section 510, veterans and their dependents who are unable to keep up payments can get an extension of mortgage for unexpired portion plus the period of military service.

Under section 603 of the National Housing Act the maximum maturity of home-mortgage loans insured thereunder is limited to 25 years and the maximum statutory interest rate is 4 percent.

GI Act operations

For home-mortgage loans guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, the maximum maturity is 25 years and the maximum-interest rate is 4 percent.

Estimated monthly and total principal and interest costs¹ on a \$5,000 mortgage

	Monthly	Total
Sec. 203 of National Housing Act ²	\$27.80	\$8,600
Sec. 603 of National Housing Act ³	26.40	8,180
Servicemen's Readjustment Act ⁴	26.40	8,180
Sec. 602, Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill ⁵	23.90	8,604
S. 287, Senator PEPPER's bill ⁶	24.60	9,446

¹ In addition, there would be about \$25.75 per month based on 1944-45 levels payable for real estate taxes (\$16.50) hazard insurance (\$1) and maintenance (\$8.25).

² Mortgage—90 percent of property valuation, 25-year maturity, 4½ percent interest. There would be an additional premium charge of one-half percent of principal—\$2.02 initially per month and declining by a few cents per month each year. The down payment would be \$260.

³ Mortgage—90 percent of property valuation, 25-year maturity, 4 percent interest. There would be an additional premium charge of one-half percent of principal—\$2.02 initially per month and declining by a few cents per month each year. The down payment would be \$260.

⁴ Mortgage—90 percent of property valuation, 25-year maturity, 4 percent interest rate. There is no premium charge. The down payment would be \$260.

⁵ Mortgage—90 percent of loan for purposes of comparison, 30-year maturity, 4 percent interest. There would be no premium charge. The down payment would be \$260.

⁶ Mortgage—90 percent of property valuation, 32-year maturity, 4½ percent interest rate. The premium charge would be the same as in note 2 above. The down payment would be \$260. At 3½ percent interest with a 30-year maturity, the monthly payments would be \$22.45 and the total payments of principal and interest would be \$8,082.

II. ECONOMIC FACTORS

1. The objective of the bill is to reduce monthly payments for veterans when wages are low relative to the high cost of living and

to enable them to bridge periods of unemployment more easily.

2. Even though prices on housing were under ceilings in 1946, a large portion of rental and sales housing in 1946 was at a higher price than many veterans indicated they could afford.

3. The average sales price in 1946 of all new permanent homes given priority authorization was \$7,500 and the average rental \$59 per month.

4. A survey in June 1946 showed that the average rent veterans said they could afford was \$43 per month and the average price they could pay for a home was \$5,500. About one-half of the veterans desired to rent.

5. About a million homes will be put under construction in 1947 and another million completed.

STATEMENT REGARDING ACTIVITIES OF FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Federal National Mortgage Association, a subsidiary of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, will now purchase first mortgages which are insured by the Federal Housing Administration under the provisions of sections 603 and 608 of the National Housing Act. The Association will continue to purchase mortgages insured under sections 203 and 207 of the act. Mortgages insured under sections 203 and 603 of the National Housing Act cover one- to four-family dwellings; mortgages insured under sections 207 and 608 of the act cover rental housing projects.

Agents of the Association in the 31 regional offices of RFC will execute contracts with Federal Housing Administration approved mortgagees for the immediate purchase of mortgages already insured under section 203 or 603 of the National Housing Act (except farm mortgages) or will issue firm commitments to purchase such mortgages when insured and delivered within a 9-month period. In the case of a commitment contract the seller will be required to deposit 1 percent of the amount of the mortgage as a commitment charge, which will be refunded to the seller upon delivery of the loan documents within the commitment period. The purchase price will be an amount equal to the unpaid principal balance of the loan, plus accrued and unpaid interest, and will be available to the seller upon delivery of the loan documents.

Effective January 1, 1948, such mortgages as the Association agrees to purchase must be delivered within 1 year after the loans have been insured by Federal Housing Administration.

The Association will also consider applications for direct loans to be secured by mortgages insured under section 207 of the National Housing Act, provided the applications are submitted prior to the beginning of construction. Applications for commitments to purchase loans insured under section 207 or 608 upon completion of construction of a housing project likewise must be submitted before construction has commenced.

Federal National Mortgage Association is without statutory authority to make direct loans secured by mortgages insured under section 608 of the National Housing Act; to make or purchase loans insured under title I of the act; or to make or purchase second-mortgage loans. The Association also lacks authority to make or purchase home loans guaranteed or insured by the Veterans' Administration.

Detailed information concerning the activities of Federal National Mortgage Association may be obtained from the loan agencies of Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

NOVEMBER 17, 1947.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES IN COASTAL LANDS

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill.

On the 6th day of February there was transmitted to the Senate by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Interior jointly proposed legislation, the announced purpose of which was "to promote and develop the conservation of certain resources in the submarine coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States." The ordinary procedure with reference to a bill transmitted by one or more of the departments would be its introduction by request, through the chairman of the appropriate committee. The senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who is chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, being absent at this time, I introduce the bill by request of the Departments referred to. I desire—

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know whether the Senator is aware of the fact that I introduced a bill on the same subject, which I frankly say was drawn by the Department of Justice.

Mr. CORDON. I did not know that. Mr. BARKLEY. It has been referred to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, in that event I ask to withdraw my bill until I can check up further. I was simply introducing it by request.

CONVEYANCE TO ESCAMBIA COUNTY, FLA., OF PORTION OF SANTA ROSA ISLAND—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PEPPER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3417) to provide for the conveyance to Escambia County, State of Florida, of a portion of Santa Rosa Island which is under the jurisdiction of the War Department, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 2159. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prepare plans and estimates for a sewage-disposal system to serve the Yorktown area of the Colonial National Historical Park, Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3344. An act to amend the fourth paragraph of section 4, chapter 1, title I, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1930 (31 Stat. 322; 48 U. S. C., sec. 101), as amended;

H. R. 3603. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Snake River and its tributaries originating in either of the two States and flowing into the other;

H. R. 3936. An act to authorize the United States Park Police to make arrests within Federal reservations in the environs of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4023. An act to authorize the establishment of the De Soto National Memorial, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4461. An act approving the performance in the field of certain functions relating to the public lands;

H. R. 4513. An act to eliminate the requirement of oaths in certain land matters, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4549. An act to authorize the enactment by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska of a code of laws for Alaska;

H. R. 4823. An act to provide adequate school facilities within Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4980. A bill relating to the acquisition by the United States of State-owned lands within Glacier National Park, in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the Park River dam and reservoir project in Walsh County, N. Dak., as the Homme Reservoir and Dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2313. A bill to amend the act of May 19, 1926 (44 Stat. 565), as amended by the acts of May 14, 1935 (49 Stat. 218), and of October 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 763), providing for the detail of the United States military and naval and Air Force missions to foreign governments; and

H. R. 5035. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Eighty-second National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Grand Rapids, Mich., September 26 to 30, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BRIDGES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 201), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eightieth Congress, \$10,000 in addition to the amounts, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946, and Senate Resolution 130, agreed to June 26, 1947.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. IVES asked and obtained consent that the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to continue hearings on Senate bill 1390 during the remainder of today's session.

Mr. TAFT asked and obtained consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming asked and obtained consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. KNOWLAND, on behalf of Senator COOPER, asked and obtained consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

AMERICAN PRINCIPLE APPLIED TO A JOINT EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPEHART

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address en-

titled "American Principle Applied to a Joint European Recovery Program," delivered by him at Peoria, Ill., on February 7, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

PAY AND RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on Saturday, February 14, 1948, at the annual meeting of Eastern States Postal Employees' Councils, at the William Penn Hotel, Harrisburg, Pa., which appears in the Appendix.]

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on February 12, 1948, in Philadelphia, Pa., at the annual banquet of the Pennsylvania State Association of Township Supervisors, which appears in the Appendix.]

TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on January 17, 1948, in connection with the ceremonies in Philadelphia marking the two hundred and forty-second anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXPANSION OF STEEL INDUSTRY—ARTICLE BY W. L. RUSSELL

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding the expansion of the steel industry, written by W. L. Russell and published in the Pittsburgh Press of February 3, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISTRIBUTION OF AMERICAN RESEARCH FUNDS—ARTICLE BY CLARENCE A. MILLS

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Distribution of American Research Funds," by Clarence A. Mills, of the University of Cincinnati, published in the magazine Science of February 6, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED STATES STAND ON THE PALESTINE SITUATION—ARTICLE BY SUMNER WELLES AND MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR BREWSTER

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "United States Stand on Palestine Viewed As Starting UN on League's Path," written by Sumner Welles and published in the New York Herald Tribune of February 17; also a memorandum prepared for him dealing with the legal problems involved, which appear in the Appendix.]

CIVIC PROBLEMS, CIVIC BODIES—ARTICLE BY JESSE C. SUTER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Civic Problems, Civic Bodies," written by Jesse C. Suter and published in the February 8, 1948, issue of the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE OIL MUDDLE—EDITORIAL FROM THE EXETER NEWS LETTER

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Oil Muddle," from the Exeter (N. H.) News Letter of February 5, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISMANTLING OF GERMAN INDUSTRIAL PLANTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW HAMPSHIRE MORNING UNION

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bridges Is Right," pertaining to the dismantling of German industrial plants, published in the New Hampshire Morning Union of February 12, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE DAYTONA BEACH EVENING NEWS

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The St. Lawrence Seaway," from the Daytona Beach Evening News, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL SECURITY WEEK

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement written by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. The statement, which appears in the current issue of the Reserve Officer, relates to National Security Week, which is now being observed throughout the country.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.

In these days of international uncertainty and tension it is very desirable that American citizens be kept constantly aware of the need for an adequate security force.

National Security Week, under the sponsorship of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, is an effective and dramatic way of reminding the American public that only a strong America can make a genuine contribution to the preservation of peace.

I am heartily in accord with the patriotic purpose behind National Security Week, and I hope every citizen of America will take part in its observance.

CHAN GURNEY,
Chairman.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, yesterday, February 16, marked the thirtieth anniversary of Lithuania's independence day. It is therefore appropriate that we pause to pay our sincere respects to our many citizens of Lithuanian descent and to join with them in the fervent hope that the day may not be too far distant when this brave little nation once again will enjoy true liberty and freedom.

We all know how the traditionally freedom-loving people of the Republic of Lithuania were the first to disappear behind the implacable "iron curtain." We have all read with distress of mass deportations, of arrests in the night, of swift trials, of executions, and of the other tragic symptoms of systematic extermination. These unhappy events can give us little cause for rejoicing on a day which commemorates a country's independence. But it should cause us to ponder seriously whether we, as the strongest Nation in the world, have not been lax and morally weak in permitting such conditions to continue to exist.

Last November the Lithuanian Minister here in the United States addressed

a moving appeal to the President of the General Assembly of the United Nations. He spoke on behalf of the Republic of Lithuania which, since 1940, has been occupied and administered by officials of the police state. He asked the United Nations to take measures, in keeping with the fundamental rights guaranteed by the United Nations Charter, to safeguard the Lithuanian people against enslavement and extermination. Certainly the United Nations cannot turn its back and look the other way when the spokesman of a small nation appeals for a hearing on life-or-death charges of this kind. Nor can we, as Americans, continue to ignore through silence an intolerable situation of this kind. Not since 1941, when the State Department issued a statement denouncing the Russian occupation of Lithuania, has there been any further official comment on our part. Our continued silence is not a matter for pride.

Mr. President, February 16 means as much to our Lithuanian friends as July 4 means to us. Let its significance not escape us. Let not its future observance be marked with the deprivation of civil rights, freedom of the press, speech, and assembly. Let this day stand once again for free elections and free religions. Let us, at the very least, lend strong moral courage to those who through ties of family, friendship, and tradition, remember Lithuania as a cradle of freedom in Europe, and who look to us, as a powerful stronghold of moral and civil liberty, for a word of encouragement and hope in these troubled times.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed following these remarks an editorial entitled "Lithuania's Independence," printed in the New York Times of February 16.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

With their country still writhing under the heel of the conqueror, the Lithuanian people commemorate today with heads bloodied but unbowed the thirtieth anniversary of the signing of their declaration of independence. After more than a century of struggle against oppression by the Russian Czars, and in defiance of the armies of the Kaiser then still on Lithuanian soil, the Council of Lithuania, on February 16, 1918, in consultation with American Lithuanians, formally declared the country to be free and independent. This act conformed with President Wilson's doctrine of the right of self-determination. There seemed to be every prospect for its continued success and prosperity when the Kaiser's empire collapsed, and when the Russian revolutionary government proclaimed that the age of "imperialistic ravishers" was over. In the peace treaty with Lithuania the Soviets "voluntarily and for all time abandoned all the sovereign rights of Russia over the Lithuanian people and their territories."

The independence of Lithuania is still recognized by the United States and most other countries, and Lithuanian diplomatic missions still function abroad. But Russia, reverting to the policies of the "imperialistic ravishers," has renounced all her pledges and treaty obligations and has again annexed Lithuania, like the two other Baltic republics, by her own unilateral action. Moreover, she is subjecting their people not only to the

oppression and terrorism that is the lot of everybody under Moscow's rule, but is deliberately pursuing a policy of extermination and deportation in the effort to replace the "unfriendly" native populations with reliable Russian Communists.

But the Lithuanian people continue to fight for independence. They are fighting as partisans in the forests. They are fighting, insofar as that is possible, at the ballot boxes. Even the Russians had to admit that in recent local elections the Communists polled only 11.6 percent of the vote, the rest going to "nonparty" candidates. Above all, they are fighting to arouse the conscience of the world, in particular that of the United Nations, to which they have submitted a plea for action against the genocide being practiced in their land. Sooner or later the world will have to take note of their struggle and give it the support it deserves.

CONCENTRATION OF ECONOMIC POWER IN JAPAN

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, on January 19, my good friend the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] delivered an address to the Senate in which he very vigorously criticized the occupation policy in Japan. He particularly directed his criticism to an order of the Far Eastern Commission known as Order 230. I suggested to the Senator from California that it would have been well if he had consulted General MacArthur in order to obtain the general's viewpoint. In answer to a question as to whether that had been done, the Senator asserted that he had not done so. I thereupon told the Senator I would forward his speech to General MacArthur for his comment. I have in my hand a copy of a letter which General MacArthur wrote me regarding Order No. 230. The letter is dated February 1, 1948, and as it is not long I should like to read it:

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS,
SUPREME COMMANDER
FOR THE ALLIED POWERS,
Tokyo, Japan, February 1, 1948.

Senator BRIEN McMAHON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McMAHON: I have your letter of January 22 and the pages from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD subsequently received under separate cover, for which I thank you.

The discussion of Senator KNOWLAND covers a policy paper of the United States formulated by the State, War, and Navy Departments and referred to the Far Eastern Commission for consideration by the other 10 governments represented on that body and to the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers for guidance. As the sources of origin, authorship, and authority are all in Washington and my responsibility limited to the executive implementation of basic decisions formulated there, I am hardly in a position 10,000 miles away to participate in the debate.

For your information, however, I did publicly state my view with respect to the underlying purpose of the policy paper known as FEC 230 on New Year's Day last and subsequently on January 6, 1948, at San Francisco the Secretary of the Army in an address before the Commonwealth Club, with marked clarity, summed up the situation as it presently exists. It is somewhat difficult to understand why these published views did not figure in the discussion of the subject matter upon the floor of the Senate, and against the possibility that the texts of such statements did not come to your attention I am enclosing herewith copies thereof which I should

be only too glad to have inserted in the RECORD as you have suggested.

In any evaluation of the economic potential here in Japan it must be understood that the tearing down of the traditional pyramid of economic power which has given only a few Japanese families direct or indirect control over all commerce and industry, all raw materials, all transportation, internal and external, and all coal and other power resources, is the first essential step to the establishment here of an economic system based upon free private competitive enterprise which Japan has never before known. Even more it is indispensable to the growth of democratic government and life, as the abnormal economic system heretofore in existence can only thrive if the people are held in poverty and slavery.

The Japanese people, you may be sure, fully understand the nature of the forces which have so ruthlessly exploited them in the past. They understand that this economic concentration not only furnished the sinews for mounting the violence of war but that its leaders, in partnership with the military, shaped the national will in the direction of war and conquest. And they understand no less fully that the material wealth comprising this vast concentration at war's start increased as war progressed, at the forfeiture of millions of Japanese lives, as resources of Japan theretofore only indirectly controlled came under direct control and ownership. These things are so well understood by the Japanese people that apart from our desire to reshape Japanese life toward a capitalistic economy, if this concentration of economic power is not torn down and redistributed peacefully and in due order under the occupation, there is no slightest doubt that its cleansing will eventually occur through a blood bath of revolutionary violence. For the Japanese people have tasted freedom under the American concept and they will not willingly return to the shackles of an authoritarian government and economy or resubmit otherwise to their discredited masters.

With expressions of cordiality,
Faithfully yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, immediately following these remarks, the documents referred to in the letter of General MacArthur.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 1, 1948.

To the People of Japan:

The design of a remodeled and reconstructed Japan is nearing completion. The pattern has been etched, the path has been laid. The development now lies largely in your own hands. Success or failure will depend upon your ability to practice the simple, yet transcendental, principles which modern civilization demands.

No occupation, however benevolent and beneficial, can substitute for the spiritual uplift which alone can lead to an invincible determination to build a future based upon the immutable concepts of human freedom—a social status under which full consciousness of individual responsibility must ever remain the keystone to the arch of success and progress.

Individual hardship is inevitable. Your economy, due to the disastrous war decisions of your past leaders, is now impoverished. This can only be relieved by employment to the maximum of the energies of your people, by wisdom and determination on the part of your leaders, and by the restoration of peace with its removal of existing limitations upon international trade. So long as your needs

continue to be greater than your productive capacity, controls upon your internal economy will be essential lest the weaker segments of your population perish. Such controls must, however, only be temporary and subject to ultimate removal in favor of free enterprise.

Economically, Allied policy has required the breaking up of that system which in the past has permitted the major part of the commerce and industry and natural resources of your country to be owned and controlled by a minority of feudal families and exploited for their exclusive benefit. The world has probably never seen a counterpart to so abnormal an economic system. It permitted exploitation of the many for the sole benefit of the few. The integration of these few with government was complete and their influence upon governmental policies inordinate, and set the course which ultimately led to war and destruction. It was, indeed, so complete a monopoly as to be in effect a form of socialism in private hands. Only through its dissolution could the way be cleared for the emergence of an economy conducive to the well-being of all the people—an economy embodying the principle of private capitalism, based upon free competitive enterprise—an economy which long experience has demonstrated alone provides the maximum incentive to the development of those fundamental requirements to human progress—individual initiative and individual energy.

Politically, progress toward reform has been equally encouraging. Your new constitution is now in full effect, and there is increasing evidence of a growing understanding of the great human ideals which it is designed to serve. Implementing laws have reoriented the entire fabric of your way of life to give emphasis to the increased responsibility, dignity, and opportunity which the individual now holds and enjoys. Government has ceased to be totalitarian and has become representative, with its functions decentralized to permit and encourage a maximum of individual thought and initiative and judgment in the management of community affairs. Control of every political segment has been shifted to permit the selection of a new leadership of your free choice capable of advancing democratic growth.

Socially, many of the shackles which traditionally have restricted individual thought and action have been severed and action has been taken to render the exercise of police power a matter for individual and community, rather than national, responsibility. The judicial system has been freed from executive and legislative controls, and laws have been enacted to temper inordinate bureaucratic power by requiring all public officials to justify the trust of public responsibility and answer for their acts directly to the people.

Every Japanese citizen can now for the first time do what he wants, and go where he wants, and say what he wants, within the liberal laws of his land. This means that you can select your own work, and when you have completed it you can choose your own method of relaxation and enjoyment, and on your day of rest you can worship as you please, and always you can criticize and express your views on the actions of your government. This is liberty. Yet inherent in it are its obligations to act with decorum and self-restraint, and become acutely conscious of the responsibilities which a free society imposes upon its every segment.

The future therefore lies in your hands. If you remain true to the great spiritual revolution which you have undergone, your nation will emerge and go on—if you accept only its benefits without its obligations, it will wither and go under. The line of demarcation is a simple one, understandable

to all men—the line between those things which are right and those things which are wrong. The way is long and hard and beset with difficulties and dangers, but it is my hope and belief and prayer this New Year's Day that you will not falter.

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE ARMY K. C. ROYALL

To many American citizens—including myself—the most surprising development—and one of the most disappointing aspects of our victory over Germany and Japan has been the responsibility and cost which have been placed upon us in the matter of occupation. There were few who originally recognized the extent of this burden. And today every citizen of our country is justified in asking the "what" and the "why" of our occupation policies.

On this occasion I will speak specifically of Japan. Immediately after the surrender, the objectives of our policy were stated to be, first, "To insure that Japan will not again become a menace to the peace and security of the world," and, second, "to bring about the earliest possible establishment of a democratic and peaceful government which will carry out its international responsibilities, respect the rights of other states, and support the objectives of the United Nations."

The underlying idea was the prevention of future Japanese aggression—direct prevention by disarmament and indirect prevention by creating a type of government unlikely to develop again the spirit of aggressive war. The real well-being of Japan—or her strength as a nation—was decidedly a secondary consideration—secondary to protection of ourselves against Japan, and secondary to payment of reparations to the victorious Allies for the damages inflicted upon them.

This attitude is clearly shown by the emphasis in the original directive, which stated in part: "Japan shall be permitted" (not encouraged but permitted) "to maintain such industries as will sustain her economy and permit the exaction of reparations * * * but not * * * enable her to rearm. * * * Access to, as distinguished from control of, raw materials should be permitted. Eventual Japanese participation in world trade * * * will be permitted."

It is clearly understandable—and it was fully in accord with the then feelings and opinions of our people—that in 1945 the main purpose of occupation should be protection against an enemy which had viciously attacked us and which had committed brutal atrocities against our troops and our private citizens.

Since then new conditions have arisen—in world politics and economics, in problems of national defense, and in humanitarian considerations. These changes must now be fully taken into account in determining our future course, but it should be remembered that these developments arose in large part after the original policies were set.

These original policies were promptly carried out. Within a few months after the end of hostilities, all Japanese tactical units had been dissolved and all implements of war destroyed or insulated. The top Japanese military organizations, as well as the infamous secret and terrorist societies, were abolished. Those who formulated the Japanese policies of conquest and aggression were removed from important political and economic positions.

War-making industries were marked for removal and reparation. This included arsenals, private munitions plants, aircraft factories, military research laboratories, synthetic rubber and oil plants, shipbuilding installations, and certain chemical, machine tool, precision bearing, thermoelectric, and

metal factories, nonferrous and others. Commitments were made to other nations for payment of reparations with those plants.

Other steps followed, including those leading to the dissolution of concentrations of property ownership and economic power. At the end of the war—and for a long period before the war—land ownership had been in the hands of a comparatively small part of the population. The system was analogous to the feudal system of past centuries, and in Japan the land barons used their power to encourage war.

In the business field, the Zaibatsu, or money cliques dominated completely and ruthlessly the Japanese economy—through holding companies and monopolies. A dozen families controlled over 75 percent of the country's commerce, industry, and finance.

The influence over the Japanese Government of these and other monopolies was almost unbounded, and they were linked inseparably with the militarists. This joint group over a course of years—and particularly in the year and a half before Pearl Harbor—encouraged Japan toward war and destruction.

Steps were taken to break both types of concentrations. Under a directive issued by the Supreme Allied Commander, the Japanese Diet enacted in the fall of 1946 a land-reform law under which, through local land commissions, the 5,500,000 Japanese farm families could acquire land from the present owners at a reasonable price and pay for it over a period of years. This program will be completed by the end of 1948. Just as in America, the small landowner is symbolically and factually democracy in practice, so we expect that in time the strength of Japanese democracy will find roots in similar soil.

Action against the Zaibatsu has proceeded vigorously, and its control has now been virtually abolished. Sixty-seven holding companies, with 4,000 subsidiaries and affiliates, have been marked for liquidation. The two largest holding companies—Mitsubishi and Mitsui—have been closed. Others of the larger ones have been almost wholly liquidated.

The Japanese Government has been directed to prepare legislation prohibiting international cartels. Stringent antitrust and deconcentration legislation has been prepared and passed in part. A Holding Company Liquidation Commission has been established and is functioning in the supervision of the entire program.

While these various steps were being taken, new developments were arising, and old factors were changing in importance. Japan had never been able to provide all of its own food—nor to produce enough of many other necessities of life. Seventy-eight million Japanese occupy an area smaller than California, and of that area only 16 percent is capable of cultivation.

The population is still growing at an enormous rate. It is expected to reach 84,000,000 by 1951. The current troubled condition in Asia leaves practically no food available for import into Japan, even if the currency and Japanese export situation would make food purchases possible—which they would not. And yet without food and other necessities, Japan would be faced with widespread starvation and disease—would seethe with unrest and disorder and hopelessness. Even aside from the simple principles of humanity, we could not, under such conditions, accomplish our original objective of a peaceful Japanese Government. Nor could we hope that Japan would be other than susceptible to totalitarianism and Shintoism with democracy, to begin to replace educational regimentation with academic freedom, and to build the foundations for a peace-loving government of the people.

For this and other achievements in Japan, great credit must be given to General MacArthur and his staff. America was, indeed, fortunate that for this vital task, it had an outstanding leader who could bring the Japanese to a complete realization of their defeat and at the same time obtain their full cooperation in forming a free and stable government.

But the Department of the Army and the Department of State—which shares the policy responsibility of occupation—both Departments realize that for political stability to continue and for free government to succeed in the future, there must be a sound and self-supporting economy, and General MacArthur in command of the occupation can be depended upon to implement these policies.

We also realize that the United States cannot forever continue to pour hundreds of millions of dollars annually into relief funds for occupied areas, and that such contributions can end without disaster only when the occupied countries can pay for their own necessities with their own production and exports.

These factors have resulted in efforts to improve in many fields the economic situation in Japan. And with this increasing economic approach there has arisen an inevitable area of conflict between the original concept of broad demilitarization and the new purpose of building a self-supporting nation.

In the case of agriculture the two purposes do happen to run practically parallel. The breaking down of feudal holdings has ended a war-making influence. At the same time the wider division of lands tends to produce incentive on the part of the larger number of landowners and thereby to increase over-all production.

But it is a different situation with manufacturing. The destruction of synthetic rubber or shipbuilding or chemical or non-ferrous metal plants will certainly destroy the war potential of Japan, but such destruction may also adversely affect the peace potential.

The dissolution of the Zaibatsu may present in itself no serious economic problem, but at some stage extreme deconcentration of industry, while further impairing the ability to make war, may at the same time impair manufacturing efficiency and reduce the over-all production and the exportable surplus of Japanese industry—may, therefore, postpone the day when Japan can become self-supporting.

Such is our dilemma. It is clear that Japan cannot support itself as a nation of shopkeepers and craftsmen and small artisans any more than it can exist as a purely agricultural nation. We can expect a continuing economic deficit in Japan, unless there is at least some degree of mass industrial production.

Another border-line situation between demilitarization and economic recovery is presented in the case of personnel. The men who were the most active in building up and running Japan's war machine—militarily and industrially—were often the ablest and most successful business leaders of that country, and their services would in many instances contribute to the economic recovery of Japan.

What should we do about them now? We cannot afford to leave the Japanese war system intact nor forget that there is danger in retaining in power leaders whose philosophy helped bring on World War II. On the other hand, we cannot afford to sterilize the business ability of Japan.

Nor can we believe without qualification individual Japanese protestations of war innocence or of peacetime reformation. One Senator said to me in Germany shortly after VE-day: "I have inquired everywhere, and

I have not yet found a single Nazi in Germany," to which could perhaps now be added, "Nor a war lord in Japan."

All these matters present questions of degree, and the decisions are matters of judgment. These decisions are not difficult at a cocktail party or from an easy chair or on a rostrum, if made by those who have no responsibility for the decisions or their results. It is somewhat different when you must live and suffer with any errors that you might make.

The Departments of State and Army are trying to draw the lines in the right place. And in doing so they are giving—and will give—full weight to the changes in political and military and economic considerations which have occurred since the initial days of occupation.

We realize that deconcentration must stop short of the point where it unduly interferes with the efficiency of Japanese industry. Earlier programs are being reexamined—as for example the details of the program stated in the paper submitted some months ago to the Far Eastern Commission, and recently given wide publicity as FEC-230.

We are not averse to modifying programs in the interests of our broad objectives. A bill recently submitted to the Japanese Diet setting up procedures for deconcentration of excessive economic power was changed before its final enactment—changed with a view of giving added weight to the economic needs of Japan.

In the case of plant dismantling and reparations—in addition to the matter of disarmament—we are bound by certain agreements with other nations—agreements which must be carried out unless breached by those others or altered by consent. However, since last summer we have had a competent group of industrial engineers in the Pacific, selecting the specific plants which, consistent with our obligations, can be dismantled with the minimum of detriment to Japanese economic recovery. The report and recommendations of this committee should reach the Department of the Army during this month.

I would not leave the impression that questions of demilitarization or reparation or deconcentration or disqualification of personnel are the most immediate obstacles to Japanese recovery. The principal difficulties arise from the destruction which was brought to Japan and to the chaotic condition which has existed in the Far East since VJ-day.

The flimsy nature of Japanese construction and the concentrated population centers made these islands most vulnerable targets for our incendiary and other missiles. Even aside from the effects on Hiroshima and Nagasaki—of the atomic bombs, many Japanese cities were largely destroyed. I believe that on a percentage basis, greater Tokyo—with about 7,000,000 people as of 1940—was as badly damaged as any enemy city in the entire world.

Japan has long been dependent on the rest of Asia not only for foodstuffs but for raw materials needed in their manufacturing and business life, and it has relied largely on general commerce with China and other neighbors. With the war and its aftermath these sources of import and export are largely nonexistent.

Many affirmative steps have been and are being taken to meet these and other difficulties—and to promote recovery and thereby hasten the day when Japan will cease to be a financial burden to the United States. I wish that time permitted me to discuss in detail our activities in many fields, including those of finance and credit and foreign trade.

Some results of our efforts are apparent. Over-all Japanese industrial production has risen from 18 percent of the 1930-34 level

in January 1946 to 40 percent in August 1947. In the case of coal—basically needed for business recovery—the present production is 86 percent of the 1930-34 level. Fertilizer has increased fourfold during occupation. One-fourth of the war-destroyed houses in Tokyo and vicinity have been replaced. Six hundred thousand acres of land have been reclaimed for cultivation, and a million more should be added by 1950.

In this whole picture of Japan do not forget that we are supervising an entire government—and one disorganized by an unsuccessful war. We have all the many normal policy and operating problems of a stable and successful government plus the added ones produced by the unusual and distressing conditions peculiar to present-day Japan.

The differences from our own country are such that we cannot expect to impose on the Japanese people an exact reproduction of American democracy. It follows that often there is no precise precedent for our problems, and the departments must do as our forefathers did in the early days of our own Government, reach the best results we can by trial and error.

The lines to be drawn are, of course, not always easy to draw, and as in the case of all decisions of importance, one cannot be too dogmatic. There can be—and are likely to be—differences of opinion among sincere and informed people. Nor do I have any illusion that everything we do will be perfect.

But I can assure you that our decisions will be made with realism and with a firm determination of doing all possible to prevent Japan from again waging unprovoked and aggressive and cruel war against any other nation. We hold to an equally definite purpose of building in Japan a self-sufficient democracy, strong enough and stable enough to support itself and at the same time to serve as a deterrent against any other totalitarian war threats which might hereafter arise in the Far East.

SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS OF L'ANSE INDIANS, MICHIGAN

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 522) to authorize the sale of certain lands of the L'Anse Band of Chippewa Indians, Michigan, which was, on page 1, line 6, after the word "of", to insert "the southeast quarter of."

Mr. WATKINS. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF INDIANS OF FORT BERTHOLD INDIAN RESERVATION, N. DAK.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate an amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1133) providing for the per capita payment of certain moneys appropriated in settlement of certain claims of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota, which was, on page 1, line 7, strike out "\$150" and insert "\$300,000 to be distributed."

Mr. WATKINS. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial which

appeared in the Eugene Register Guard, my home-town newspaper, last week. The editorial is entitled "Political Freedom at Issue," and it deals with the Taft-Hartley law.

I wish to say for the record that I share every criticism of the Taft-Hartley law, which the editorial makes; indeed, every criticism of the Taft-Hartley law contained in the editorial is also to be found in the speeches delivered by the junior Senator from Oregon on the Taft-Hartley bill when it was before the Congress. I predict that as the campaign of 1948 gets under way the criticisms of the Taft-Hartley bill which were made during the debate on it during the course of its passage through the Congress will come home to roost. However, it is not too late for my party to take the steps it should take in adopting at this session of Congress some constructive amendments to the Taft-Hartley law. As the clouds of recession and possible depression, with consequent unemployment, start to hover over this land, people then will discover what a legal monstrosity the Taft-Hartley law really is. Millions of dollars are being spent in propaganda to convince the American worker that the Taft-Hartley law does not destroy or injure any of his legitimate rights. However, the propaganda is not fooling the workers because they are already beginning to experience the injustices of the law including its return to Government by injunction. I shall continue, Mr. President, across this land during the campaign, to make my fight for constructive amendments to the Taft-Hartley law, because in its present form it cannot be justified by the leaders of any political party.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL FREEDOM AT ISSUE

Futility is a mild word, in our opinion, for those sections of the Taft-Hartley law which seek to make it a crime for labor unions or their leaders to spend union funds for political purposes. Indictment of Philip Murray, chieftain of CIO, brings sections to a test of constitutionality.

It is always unsafe to predict how the Supreme Court will interpret the Constitution or any section of it or amendment to it, but the issue in this case will be whether these sections of the Taft-Hartley bill conflict with the first amendment:

"Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press."

It appears that Mr. Murray, with CIO funds, bought ads in the CIO News in behalf of a candidate for Congress in Maryland, and he probably would not even attempt to deny that he did this deliberately and defiantly.

Was this act within his rights as a citizen?

We think it was. We think that the privilege of publishing a political statement is one which must never be denied to any citizen or any group of citizens, and that the laws of libel are the only boundaries of that privilege. The fact that this privilege has been or may be abused has nothing

to do with the main issue—the right or privilege of publishing a political opinion.

Likewise we think that the right or privilege of contributing moral or financial support to a party or to a candidate is one which can be limited only by clearcut and equitable definitions of "corrupt practices."

Take any of these rights away from labor unions, labor leaders or any other class of people, and you are paving a nice, swift road to dictatorship.

"But what about such smelly things as that gift of \$500,000 out of United Mine Workers' funds which John L. Lewis made to the Roosevelt campaign in 1936, and apparently without consulting his miners?"

For the public, the best defense against such tactics is complete and merciless publicity. For union members whose treasuries may be raided by ambitious and unscrupulous leaders, the remedy lies in the votes within the union. There is nothing in the Constitution of the United States which says that a union may not prohibit the use of its funds for political purposes, except with the voted consent of the members.

Whether the offenders are great business corporations or rich labor unions, there is a point beyond which legitimate financial support of parties or candidates becomes an effort to buy preferment and publication of these transactions is a powerful weapon because, where the people are informed of such transactions there is instinctive and fierce resentment, such as that which followed news of the Lewis deal in 1936.

A public accounting of how a great union has administered its funds can do more to correct abuses than any effort to regulate in advance how they shall be spent. In too many unions the members have had no voice, political or otherwise, in their own affairs.

We do not think that political activity of unions or union leaders can or should be prohibited. There are grave abuses, but we have a hunch the Supreme Court will share our extremely conservative view that the remedy does not lie in abridging freedom of political action or free speech.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, following the remarks by the Senator from Oregon regarding the Taft-Hartley law, I suggest that the most constructive amendment of that law would be its repeal. I hope the Senator from Oregon will associate himself with a good many of us who have introduced a bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act as the most constructive possible amendment of that legislation.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to state for the information of the Senate that when the Senate concludes its business today it will recess until tomorrow, at which time it may be possible to take up the measure relating to the legislative budget. A recess then will probably be taken until Friday, when we will start the consideration of the rent-control bill, if that be possible.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection, in view of the speeding of time, I think it is very important that the Senate begin and conclude the consideration of rent-control legislation at the very earliest possible date. As everyone knows, the present law will expire on the 29th of February. The Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate has ordered a bill reported, which report I presume will be made today, ex-

tending the present law for 14 months. The House committee has voted out a joint resolution extending the present law for 1 month, with a view of giving more time for the consideration of the matter. From all standpoints, I think it would be extremely desirable if a bill could be passed before the expiration of the present law extending rent controls, under whatever form Congress will agree to do it, for a period of a year, or such other period in that neighborhood as may be agreed upon, rather than pass a measure temporarily extending the law for 30 days.

I make this observation in the hope that the Senate may be able to get rid of the question of rent control before the present law expires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to say to the Senator from Kentucky that his information is correct, that, subject to the ability of the various attorneys to get the bill in proper form, it will be reported to the Senate during the course of this afternoon.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the request has not been made, I suggest that the committee be allowed to have that done during the recess of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order is made.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduced for appropriate reference a bill authorizing the appropriation of a billion dollars for rural electrification.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2168) authorizing the appropriation of \$1,000,000,000 for the purposes of rural electrification, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, during the last 6 years, in the Great Plains area, in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Nebraska, and Minnesota, and one or two of the adjoining States, there has been a woeful lack in the building of power lines and other facilities by REA. As I stated last Friday, when discussing the subject, there are hundreds of thousands of farmers who as much as 4 or 5 or 6 years ago joined REA cooperatives, but who have not yet had built up to and connected with their farms the lines which would provide power and electricity.

Most of us are familiar with the investigation of the subject conducted by the distinguished former Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Shipstead. About a year ago he conducted hearings which lasted some 3 or 4 weeks on the subject of REA cooperatives. Upon taking up the subject of the lack of expansion of REA in the Great Plains area, and in the Midwestern States, I was told by Mr. Claude Wickard that it was partly due to a lack of personnel. Therefore the Civil Service

Committee of the Senate investigated the personnel of the entire REA administration. The hearings before our committee lasted approximately 3 weeks. Nearly every hearing was attended by Mr. Claude Wickard, Administrator of Rural Electrification in the United States. As a result of his testimony, and the testimony of others before our committee, I have today introduced a bill authorizing the appropriation of \$1,000,000,000 for the extension of REA.

One of the most important statements made at the hearings was that by Mr. Claude Wickard himself. I intend to read all of it into the RECORD, with my comments thereon. Mr. Wickard, on the 22d day of January, testified as follows:

To assist the committee—

He referred to the Civil Service Commission of the Senate—

In its examination of the Rural Electrification Administration, I would like to describe briefly the background of rural-electrification development in this country, the origin and purpose of REA, how the agency operates, what progress it is making, and the special problems existing at this time. I hope that such a report will assist you in understanding the personnel problems and policies of our agency.

Many Senators are busy with plans for loans to Greece, to Turkey, to Great Britain, and to other countries. Many are busily engaged in working on the Marshall plan. While they are busy trying to assist other people all over the world, I have received letters from farmers all over the Great Plains area protesting against the way in which the REA has been handled, both by the Democratic administration and the Republican majority in Congress. I may say that, if anything, the writers of these letters are more severe in their criticism of the way the Republican Congress has handled the REA than with the way in which the Democratic administration has handled it. I have received hundreds upon hundreds of letters protesting against the way in which REA is handled, and in substance the letters are all alike. The writers say that 4 or 5 or 6 years ago they joined an REA cooperative and paid in the money required, but from the day they paid in their money until today they have heard nothing more about the matter. Other letters, of course, say that since the writers have paid in their money there have been some meetings held, and some poles have been set up. Some say there are poles standing without any wires being strung upon them, and that up to the present time they have received no service through REA.

Other letters say that poles have been erected, and some wires have been strung, and then suddenly there has developed a so-called shortage of wire, so that all the work could not be completed. Other letters say that poles have been erected and lines have been strung, but that there are no aluminum conductors available, and therefore, the writers are without light and power.

Strangely enough, Mr. President, letter after letter sets forth that, although the REA was in the field before a private

power company was anywhere near, yet owing to the ostensible lack of material and the fact that REA, so it was alleged, could not secure the necessary material, the local private power companies have built in their lines, sometimes with loans obtained from the Government, and have thus picked off the cream of the farmers around the small towns, with the result that now, when the REA has become organized, it is handicapped because it cannot induce certain farmers to join the REA and cannot hook up and connect with the local cooperatives.

Mr. Wickard very carefully, clearly, concisely, and logically explained how that development occurred throughout the country. He continued in his testimony:

Rural electrification had made little progress in this country up to 1935. Despite the extensive use of electric power in industry and of electric lighting in the cities and towns, only 744,000 farms, or slightly more than 10 percent of all the farms in the country, had received electric service as of January 1 of that year.

Mr. President, let me again interpolate, as I did last Friday, some figures at that point. Two years ago, when our soldiers were returned from foreign countries in which they had been stationed, they told, among other things, of the development of electric light and power in the rural communities of various foreign countries. They stated that in Finland, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, from 95 to 100 farmers out of every 100 had light and power upon their farms. They said that in Germany 95 percent of all the farms were energized; that is, had electric light and power. Soldiers who had been stationed in Japan, on their return home told us that 95 out of every 100 farmers in Japan had electric light and power upon their farms.

Two years ago, Mr. President, and the statement is true even today, less than 50 percent, less than one-half the farmers of the United States had light and power upon their farms.

I see in his seat the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD]. In his State 90 out of every 100 farmers have light and power upon their farms.

In the State of the present Presiding Officer, the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], 81 farmers out of every 100 have light and power on their farms.

The State of Rhode Island has the highest percentage of farm electrification in the United States. In that State 95 out of every 100 farmers have light and power on their farms. The State of Rhode Island, in which there is the highest percentage of farm electrification, does not have a higher percentage of rural electrification and power per capita than do the farmers of Japan, the figure being practically the same, but Rhode Island does not have as much rural electrification as there is in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, or Germany.

Mr. Wickard tells the reason why the private power companies, operating with private funds invested for the purpose of

yielding dividends to the stockholders, were reluctant to build rural lines.

I remember one day discussing the matter with the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I had told him that in 1935, 1936, and 1937, if a farmer wanted to hook up with a private power company which had a line which passed right by the farmer's house, or which required the erection of only three or four or five poles, it would cost the farmer from \$1,100 to \$1,200 or \$1,300 to be hooked up with the private power line. The distinguished Senator from Oregon told me that before REA and some other projects were developed in his State pretty much the same situation existed in his State.

Mr. President, of course the average farmer throughout the Great Plains area could not afford to pay \$1,100, \$1,200, or \$1,300 simply to hook up his farm with a private line in order to receive light and power. Between 1935 and 2 years ago, a period roughly of 11 or 12 years, finally 25 farmers out of every 100 in the State of Montana, which is in the Great Plains area, secured light and power. In the State of Minnesota, 40 farmers out of every 100 secured light and power. But among 45 States of the Union, North Dakota is at the very bottom. In that State less than 7 farmers out of every 100 have light and power on their farms.

Mr. President, I introduced a bill today which provides for the expenditure of \$1,000,000,000 for the extension of REA all over the United States. I particularly call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to paragraph (c), the last paragraph of the bill, which gives the Administrator of REA the right to use 10 percent of the money appropriated in the 10 States which are at the bottom of the list. In other words, for the first time in the States of Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and several other States, the REA Administrator would be given authority, in his discretion, to spend, in addition to the amount REA receives now under existing law, 10 percent of the amount authorized by my bill in the States which are now at the very bottom of the list of States.

Mr. Wickard continued:

There was money to be made in extending electric service in towns and cities, where the number of electric consumers per mile of line runs into the hundreds. Building rural lines with a consumer density of from only 1 to 6 per mile of line did not seem likely to be profitable. Practically the only rural families that had received electric high-line service were those living in large villages or situated near transmission lines that connected population centers. Many private power companies would agree to the building of rural lines only if the farmers themselves paid for much or all of the construction costs of the line, which then usually became the company's property.

I am sure that my distinguished colleague from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], who lives in the Great Plains area, will bear me out in the statement that in 1935, 1936, 1937, or 1938, if a private line hooked up with the farmer and

the farmer paid \$1,100 or \$1,200, even after the farmer paid it the private company owned the line for which the farmer paid. That was the rule under which they operated.

Mr. Wickard further stated:

In addition, farmers were usually required to guarantee the payment of monthly or annual sums far in excess of what urban consumers had to pay or what the farmers could afford to pay. As a consequence, the great majority of farmers seemed to be doomed to get along without the conveniences and the advantages of high-line electric service.

It appeared unlikely that rural electrification would proceed at a more rapid pace without assistance. That assistance was provided by the Congress when funds for promotion of rural electrification were included in the emergency relief appropriation of 1935. On May 11, 1935, the Rural Electrification Administration was established by Presidential executive order. In 1936, the Congress authorized a 10-year program of rural electrification in the Rural Electrification Act. Under the act, the Administrator of REA is authorized to make loans for bringing electric service to persons in rural areas not receiving such service. REA operates no electric facilities and makes no grants. Its loans are made on a self-liquidating basis and are sufficient to cover the full cost of constructing lines and other electric facilities. They bear 2 percent interest and are repaid over a maximum of 35 years.

I invite attention to the fact that Mr. Wickard testified that these amounts were not grants. They were loans. They were not like some of the so-called loans about which we hear. Six or seven months ago I heard the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] say:

We are sending \$80,000,000 to China. I know that we are pouring it down a rat hole, but I am in favor of sending it. We are going to send \$20,000,000 a month more.

Mr. President, every single dollar loaned out to REA represents a bona fide loan. Of the hundreds of REA's in this country, only one is in default at the present time. Seventeen million dollars' worth of interest, which is not yet due but is payable in the future, has already been paid. So Senators can see the excellent financial situation of REA.

Mr. Wickard further stated:

The act authorizes the Administrator to make loans to public bodies and agencies, to power companies, and to nonprofit cooperative associations of rural consumers. However, it became apparent early in the program that power companies were not interested in applying for any considerable number of REA loans. Certain power-company officials, in fact, went as far as to express the opinion publicly that practically all farms that could use power advantageously already had electric service. So farm people themselves took the initiative of organizing their own cooperative associations to provide themselves with electric service.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am very much pleased that the Senator from North Dakota is making the statement he is making on the REA problems and on the need for greater development of the electric-power resources of the country. With the Senator's permission, I should like

to invite his attention to a very definite trend, so far as a change of attitude is concerned on the part of private power utilities, as well as public power groups, toward the development of large power dams. Both groups are now getting together frequently in joint conference as to the need of a greater development of power resources.

It was not so many years ago that we found great private utilities very much concerned with and opposed to the movement for the development of the Nation's power resources, apparently because of fear that there would result great public ownership developments, and that the private utilities would thereby be forced out of business. Such fears were not well founded, as subsequent events have proved.

We now find public power advocates and private power advocates joining in various sections of the country in support of the maximum development of the Nation's power resources. In no section is this trend more pronounced than in my section of the Pacific Northwest.

The Senator from North Dakota will recall that last year, in discussing the need for greater power development, the junior Senator from Oregon introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what was then called the Tacoma agreement, an agreement entered into by the advocates of various power developments. The agreement was entered into by officials of Bonneville and officials of the private utilities of the Pacific Northwest, urging upon the Congress a greater development of the power resources of that area. Such a development can come about only if we proceed to build the great wealth-producing projects of the Northwest, such as McNary Dam, Hungry Horse, Foster Creek, and the others.

As a supplement to the Tacoma agreement, I should like to have the Senator's permission to have made a part of the RECORD—because I think it bears upon the points which he is making—a telegram which was recently addressed to Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for Civil Functions of the War Department. The telegram is dated January 30, 1948, and reads as follows:

JANUARY 30, 1948.

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Appropriations for Civil Functions of War Department, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned representatives of public and private electric-distribution systems serving more than 1,000,000 consumers in Washington and Oregon respectfully urge the vital need for appropriations that will bring McNary Dam on Columbia into production of power at earliest possible date.

Electric-power requirements of Pacific Northwest today exceed safe-operating capacity of existing generators, and the load is steadily growing. Our consolidated estimates indicate load will increase 397,000 kilowatts in 1948; 345,000 kilowatts in 1949; 336,000 kilowatts in 1950; and that there will be an average annual increase of 290,000 kilowatts from 1951 to 1956.

Part of this growth in power needs will be met by non-Federal plant additions, but magnitude of total requirements makes it im-

perative that major developments on Columbia River be expedited if people of region are to be protected against far-reaching losses that will result from any continued shortage of an essential element to growth and prosperity of Pacific Northwest. McNary Dam, already under construction, offers most expeditious source of large block of new power from Columbia and any delays in completion of this project will be costly to region and will entail unnecessary revenue loss to Government. Such delays would also require huge quantities of oil to be burned in steam-power plants on emergency basis, with attendant serious drain on Nation's short supply of petroleum.

Each and every electric-distribution system in region is carrying unprecedented responsibilities in connection with major expansion of its facilities, and the immediate foreseeable power needs of Pacific Northwest can be met only if Federal Government likewise recognizes its public-utility status and responsibilities as a major supplier of electricity at wholesale in the area.

This is particularly important because Federal Government through its program of multiple-purpose dams has preempted the development of Pacific Northwest's greatest power-producing stream, the Columbia River. Thus the Federal Government has a direct responsibility to the people of the Northwest to carry forward its power-supply projects.

In view of these immediate problems we urge that a distinction in budget making be recognized between ordinary public works and the Pacific Northwest Federal power-development program, and that the Congress approve a level of expenditures sufficient to expedite construction of McNary Dam and bring it into production of power as rapidly as physically possible.

Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee: Washington Water Power Co., Spokane, Wash.; Pacific Power & Light Co., Portland, Ore.; Portland General Electric Co., Portland, Ore.; Puget Sound Power & Light Co., Seattle, Wash.; Seattle City Light, Department of Lighting; Mountain States Power Co., Albany, Ore.; Tacoma City Light, Tacoma, Wash.; Northwest Public Power Association, Longview, Wash.; Chairman C. A. Erdahl, Commissioner of Public Utilities, Tacoma

I wish to say to my good friend the Senator from North Dakota that the proposals made in this telegram are in line with the proposals the junior Senator from Oregon has made in this body since the year 1945. We cannot begin to serve the needs of all groups in the Pacific Northwest, including the farmers, for whom the Senator from North Dakota is making such an able plea here today, unless we recognize the responsibility of the National Government to go forward in the building of these great power projects. I repeat now what I have said so many times, that in the long run it will be done without cost to the Government, because of the self-liquidating nature of these dams. Of course, it will be done with the resultant benefit of increasing present wealth and adding new wealth out of which new tax dollars can flow in payment of the national debt.

I wish to thank the Senator from North Dakota for permitting me to make this statement at this time, because I join with him wholeheartedly in his views regarding the need for the development of

the power resources of the Nation. I say to the farmers of the Pacific Northwest that the responsibility for meeting their electric-power needs rests on the Congress of the United States and no place else. Unless the Congress of the United States lives up to that responsibility, then my answer to the farmers of the Pacific Northwest, when they ask me for help in the effort to obtain the power-resource developments they need, will be that the Congress of the United States to date has failed to appropriate the necessary funds

for the construction of these power-development projects. The voters of the Nation must make clear to the Members of Congress that the power resources of the Nation must be developed quickly if we are to expand our economy to the point necessary to meet our domestic economic needs.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed a chart prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture, Rural Electrification Ad-

ministration, which shows, by States, for 1935, 1945, 1946, and 1947, the number of farms electrified with central station service. It also shows the rank of each State. I particularly advise Senators who are interested in the subject of rural electrification to examine this chart to ascertain exactly where their own States stand.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE No. 1.—Comparison of rank, percentage, and number of farms electrified with central-station service, by States, 1935, 1945, 1946, and 1947

Area	Farms, Jan. 1, 1935, number ¹	Farms receiving central- station electric service, Dec. 31 1934			Farms, Jan. 1, 1945, number ¹	Farms receiving central- station electric service, Jan. 1, 1945			Farms receiving central- station electric service, June 30, 1946			Farms receiving central- station electric service, June 30, 1947			Increase in electrified farms from Dec. 31, 1934, to June 30, 1947		
		Number ²	Percent	Rank		Number ²	Percent	Rank	Number ²	Percent	Rank	Number ²	Percent	Rank	Number	Percent	Rank
United States.....	6,812,350	743,954	10.9	-----	5,859,169	2,679,184	45.7	-----	3,180,303	54.3	-----	3,574,641	61.0	-----	2,830,687	380.5	-----
Alabama.....	273,455	11,053	4.0	33	223,369	64,833	29.0	39	86,564	38.8	37	107,281	48.0	36	96,228	870.6	13
Arizona.....	18,824	5,577	29.6	12	13,142	8,603	65.5	18	9,594	73.0	19	11,129	84.7	14	5,552	99.6	41
Arkansas.....	253,013	2,943	1.2	47	198,769	42,058	21.2	45	63,102	31.8	45	83,957	42.2	40	81,014	2,732.8	2
California.....	150,360	81,093	53.9	1	138,917	118,536	85.3	5	123,246	88.7	7	125,414	90.3	11	44,321	54.7	47
Colorado.....	69,644	7,145	11.2	25	47,618	23,161	48.6	25	28,133	59.1	24	32,794	68.8	24	25,649	359.0	25
Connecticut.....	32,157	10,138	31.5	10	22,241	19,555	87.9	3	21,133	95.0	1	21,914	98.5	1	11,776	116.2	40
Delaware.....	10,381	1,791	17.3	20	9,296	5,547	59.7	20	6,357	68.4	21	7,614	81.9	16	5,823	328.1	28
Florida.....	72,857	5,700	7.8	26	61,159	24,189	39.6	27	30,792	50.3	28	35,985	58.8	26	30,285	531.3	18
Georgia.....	250,544	6,956	2.8	41	225,897	76,031	33.7	35	95,727	42.4	34	121,613	53.8	32	114,657	1,648.3	6
Idaho.....	45,113	13,433	29.8	11	41,498	31,034	74.8	11	34,733	83.7	10	38,719	93.3	7	25,286	188.2	35
Illinois.....	231,312	28,379	12.3	23	204,239	116,989	57.3	23	134,890	66.0	22	153,015	74.9	22	124,636	429.2	22
Indiana.....	200,835	25,476	11.7	24	175,970	121,457	69.0	15	137,369	78.1	15	150,308	85.4	13	126,832	540.3	17
Iowa.....	221,986	32,047	14.4	22	208,934	123,348	59.0	21	155,506	74.4	18	165,103	79.0	20	133,056	415.2	23
Kansas.....	174,589	13,224	7.6	28	141,192	44,653	31.6	36	51,273	36.3	41	58,903	41.7	41	45,679	345.4	26
Kentucky.....	278,298	8,480	3.0	39	238,501	68,971	28.9	40	87,791	36.8	39	104,434	43.3	39	95,954	1,131.5	11
Louisiana.....	170,216	2,826	1.7	46	129,295	31,333	24.2	43	49,239	38.1	38	59,213	45.8	38	56,387	1,995.3	3
Maine.....	41,907	13,959	33.3	8	42,184	26,775	63.5	19	29,072	68.9	20	31,493	74.7	23	17,534	125.6	39
Maryland.....	44,501	6,791	15.3	21	41,315	23,726	57.4	22	26,960	65.3	23	32,433	78.5	21	25,642	377.6	24
Massachusetts.....	35,094	14,494	41.3	7	37,007	32,887	88.9	2	34,071	92.1	3	35,223	95.2	2	20,729	143.0	38
Michigan.....	196,517	42,152	21.4	17	175,268	143,359	81.8	7	153,725	87.7	8	161,239	92.0	9	119,087	282.5	31
Minnesota.....	203,302	13,783	6.8	30	188,952	87,500	46.3	26	106,284	56.2	25	117,931	62.4	25	104,148	756.6	15
Mississippi.....	311,683	2,802	.9	48	263,528	49,047	18.6	46	64,435	24.5	46	86,740	32.9	46	83,938	2,955.6	1
Missouri.....	278,454	17,893	6.4	31	242,934	73,186	30.1	37	97,942	40.3	35	119,491	49.2	35	101,598	567.8	16
Montana.....	50,564	2,768	5.5	32	37,747	10,899	28.9	41	13,497	35.8	42	15,644	41.4	42	12,876	465.2	20
Nebraska.....	133,616	9,644	7.1	29	111,756	37,752	33.8	34	40,689	36.4	40	42,503	38.0	45	32,959	345.3	27
Nevada.....	3,696	946	25.6	15	3,429	1,792	52.2	24	1,846	53.8	26	1,882	54.9	29	935	98.9	42
New Hampshire.....	17,695	9,495	53.7	2	18,786	15,200	80.9	9	16,054	85.5	9	16,978	90.4	10	7,483	78.8	44
New Jersey.....	29,375	15,162	51.6	4	26,226	23,481	89.5	1	24,656	94.0	2	24,952	95.1	4	9,790	64.6	46
New Mexico.....	41,369	1,350	3.3	37	29,695	7,093	23.9	44	10,250	34.5	44	12,063	40.6	43	10,713	793.6	14
New York.....	177,025	57,825	32.7	9	149,490	120,986	80.9	8	134,237	89.8	6	140,712	94.1	6	82,887	143.3	37
North Carolina.....	309,967	9,672	3.2	38	287,412	107,637	37.5	30	131,378	45.7	30	157,581	54.8	30	147,909	1,529.2	7
North Dakota.....	84,606	1,968	2.3	43	69,520	7,141	10.3	48	8,091	12.4	48	10,831	15.6	48	8,863	450.4	21
Ohio.....	255,146	48,048	18.8	19	220,575	102,590	46.5	13	182,424	82.7	11	198,512	90.0	12	150,464	313.2	30
Oklahoma.....	213,325	5,648	2.6	42	164,790	44,634	27.1	42	64,548	39.2	36	78,651	47.7	37	73,003	1,292.5	8
Oregon.....	64,826	17,839	27.5	14	63,126	46,652	73.9	12	51,857	82.1	12	58,226	92.2	8	40,387	226.4	33
Pennsylvania.....	191,284	45,182	23.6	16	171,761	122,774	71.5	14	136,388	79.4	13	143,593	83.6	15	98,411	217.8	34
Rhode Island.....	4,327	1,975	45.6	6	3,603	3,108	86.3	4	3,248	90.1	5	3,594	97.3	2	1,529	77.4	45
South Carolina.....	165,504	3,796	2.3	44	147,745	52,047	35.2	33	63,227	42.8	33	77,048	52.2	33	73,252	1,929.7	4
South Dakota.....	83,303	2,939	3.5	36	68,705	8,556	12.5	47	10,143	14.8	47	12,484	18.2	47	9,545	324.8	29
Tennessee.....	273,783	9,727	3.6	34	234,431	69,546	29.7	38	83,381	35.6	43	94,703	40.4	44	84,976	873.6	12
Texas.....	501,017	11,466	2.3	45	384,977	152,219	39.5	28	196,010	51.1	27	214,648	55.8	27	203,182	1,772.0	5
Utah.....	30,695	16,130	52.5	3	26,322	19,822	75.3	10	20,762	78.9	14	20,965	79.6	17	4,835	30.0	48
Vermont.....	27,061	7,945	29.4	13	26,490	17,943	67.7	16	19,894	75.1	17	21,060	79.5	18	13,115	165.1	36
Virginia.....	197,632	14,954	7.6	27	173,051	61,954	35.8	32	77,786	44.9	32	93,221	53.9	31	78,267	623.4	10
Washington.....	84,381	40,060	47.5	5	79,887	66,446	83.2	6	72,388	90.6	4	75,582	94.6	5	35,522	88.7	43
West Virginia.....	104,747	3,647	3.5	35	97,600	37,731	38.7	29	44,137	45.2	31	49,500	50.7	34	45,853	1,257.3	10
Wisconsin.....	199,877	39,206	19.6	18	177,745	119,623	67.3	17	137,751	77.5	16	140,662	79.1	19	101,456	258.8	32
Wyoming.....	17,487	527	3.0	40	13,076	4,780	36.6	31	6,283	48.0	29	7,190	55.0	28	6,663	1,264.3	9

¹ United States Census of Agriculture 1935 and 1945.

² Edison Electric Institute.

³ United States Census of Agriculture, 1945, adjusted to exclude home plants.

⁴ REA estimate (revised September 1947).

⁵ REA estimate.

Mr. LANGER. I may say, Mr. President, that North Dakota stands forty-eighth, or at the bottom of the list. In talking this matter over with my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], we have determined to keep battling upon the Senate floor until the farmers of North Dakota get what they are rightly and legally entitled to. Instead of the distribution shown by the chart, we intend to see that, under the bill I have introduced, if it shall be enacted, one-tenth of all the money that is made avail-

able shall be used for the purpose of increasing the facilities in the 10 States which are at the bottom, in the discretion of the Administrator as to the amount of money he will spend, and the amount of material he will allocate if he gets the material, so that in REA service the States in the Great Plains area shall be placed in a position somewhat similar, at least, to that of the other States of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. YOUNG. As I understand the provisions of the bill, they are not at all unreasonable, and the measure is along the line of the provision inserted in the Soil Conservation Act last year, extending relief more on the basis of need.

Mr. LANGER. It is similar to that.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator certainly has my wholehearted support, and I hope his bill will be enacted.

Mr. LANGER. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, it is essential to an understanding of the REA program and the functions of the REA staff that the full extent to which this is a cooperative program be appreciated. Rural electric co-ops constitute more than 90 percent of all the borrowers of REA loan funds, and have received more than 95 percent of all the loans made.

A rural electric co-op is owned by those who use the power it distributes. I emphasize the statement that it is owned by those who use the power it distributes. Retail rates are based on cost with allowance for repayment of the Government loan. Interest and amortization are paid from revenue. Each member has one vote at business meetings. A board of directors is elected once a year. The directors employ the manager, fix the rates, and otherwise direct the business, reporting periodically to the membership.

Rural electric cooperatives have many advantages as instruments for making electric service available to farmers at reasonable cost. First, REA-financed co-ops operate on a nonprofit basis. This enables them to provide electric service at cost. Second, directors of REA-financed co-ops are elected because of their own interest in making electric service available to rural people at reasonable rates. They serve without compensation, and keep operating expense at the lowest possible level consistent with good service. Third, members of rural electric co-ops themselves provide many services that help keep operating expenses low. For example, members are encouraged to report potential causes of service interruptions, such as tree limbs touching the lines. Most of them read their own meters and many make out their own bills. I know that will surprise many Senators, but that is the official record of the national administration of the REA. Fourth, previous experience of farmers with other types of co-ops helps them to organize and operate rural electric co-ops on a sound basis with a minimum of effort and expense.

I have no hesitation in saying that without these co-ops the rural-electrification program authorized by the Congress could not have been made effective, and that rural electric co-ops provide the only real hope of many farm families to get power-line electric service within the foreseeable future.

The extent to which the co-ops have been effective in carrying out the Rural Electrification Act is indicated in part by the great increase in rural electrification that has occurred in this country since 1935. I have already pointed out that only 1 farm in 10 was electrified 12 years ago. By July 1, 1947, REA's official estimate showed that a total of 3,575,000 farms, or 61 percent of all the farms in the country, were electrified. More than half of the farms receiving electric service since 1935 have been con-

nected to REA-financed lines. Most of the rest are on lines of commercial power companies, which have been stimulated to greater rural-electrification activity by the REA program.

Progress in farm electrification, by States, since the initiation of the REA program, is shown in table I, which I have asked to have printed in the RECORD.

I shall now show how the REA program works. The amount which REA is authorized to lend annually is fixed by Congress, and REA then borrows the amount of its loan authorization from the United States Treasury.

Half of the amount available for loans in any given year is reserved for loans in the various States on the basis of the proportion that each State's unelectrified farms bear to the total number of unelectrified farms in the country. The other half of the fund may be used for loans at the discretion of the Administrator, but not more than 10 percent may be loaned in any one State or Territory.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact, for example, that in the State of Connecticut, in the State of Rhode Island, in the State of Massachusetts, and in the State of West Virginia none of the money set aside by the Congress was used. Therefore, that money remained in the Treasury. In my opinion, the Administrator should have the power to use, in his discretion, any money not used, because it can readily be seen that when the Appropriation Committee meets, or when the political committee of either the Democratic or Republican Party meets, it gets a report from the REA Administration which says, "There is \$5,000,000, \$10,000,000, \$50,000,000 available which has not been used," when as a matter of fact that is not strictly true, because either it has already been assigned to projects which are in the course of being constructed or it is set aside for those States which are not going to use it, and the Administrator knows it is not going to be used. So this provision, that the other half of the fund may be used for loans in the discretion of the Administrator, but not more than 10 percent may be loaned in any one State, is not quite sufficient, and the law should be changed as provided in the bill I am introducing.

Most REA borrowers operate only distribution systems and purchase power at wholesale from commercial power companies or public agencies. Distribution facilities account for nearly 90 percent of all REA loans made to date. A little more than 6 percent have been for generating plants and a little less than 5 percent for transmission facilities, a substantial part of which is an inherent part of distribution systems.

REA finances generation facilities only when borrowers are unable to obtain adequate supplies of power or to purchase power at reasonable wholesale rates. About 1 percent of the total loans ap-

proved have been for the installation of wiring, plumbing, and electrical equipment and appliances on consumers' premises. These loans are made to co-ops, which in turn make loans to their consumers. REA itself makes no loans direct to consumers.

Mr. President, very much to my surprise I found that the average citizen with whom I conversed, who was not familiar with the subject, did not know that to be true.

Mr. Wickard continued:

Before any REA loan can be made, the borrower is required to submit a detailed application, on the basis of which REA can determine whether or not the loan is feasible, that is, whether or not the facilities to be constructed appear to be reasonable security for the loan. If an application is approved, a loan contract is entered into between REA and the borrower, binding the borrower to performance of a specific amount of power system construction and binding the Government to finance the work. Before construction begins, the borrower submits detailed plans and specifications for approval by the REA engineering staff. Loan funds are actually advanced to the borrower only as they are needed to pay for completed construction which meets good engineering standards.

Again, Mr. President, I digress for a moment to show the complete misunderstanding on the part even of farmers who are customers of REA. Some of the customers believe they do not have the right to select their own engineer. As a matter of fact, they do have that right. All the REA cooperatives which have been organized within the last 3 or 4 years have the right, and indeed, it is a requisite that they select their own engineer. But when it comes to the selection of a permanent engineer, then approval must be obtained from the national administration, so that the national administration in making the loan will know exactly what the situation is in the REA, and whether or not the amount of the loan requested is justified or whether it should be made at all.

Mr. Wickard continued as follows:

Originally, REA loans were made for 25 years with interest at rates ranging from 2½ to 3 percent. Under the Pace amendment of 1944, however, extension of all loans to 35 years, with interest at a flat 2 percent, was authorized. These extensions have been completed in the case of about 85 borrowers and are being made for others requesting them as rapidly as the legal work can be done. Ordinarily, under the 35-year amortization plan, interest on each note is deferred for 2 years, with the borrower making equal quarterly payments of principal and interest thereafter.

To summarize the REA loan program, I might say that as of December 31, 1947, REA had approved loans totaling \$1,191,000,000 to 1,029 borrowers, of which 947 were co-ops, 41 were public-power districts, 20 were other types of public bodies, and 21 were commercial power companies. Of these borrowers, 904 have rural electric facilities in operation. The facilities include 594,000 miles of lines serving about 2,030,000 farms and other rural consumers in about 2,200 counties of 46 States, Alaska, and the Virgin Islands.

These features of the program are summarized in tables Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 which contain both national totals and State breakdowns.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tables 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The tables are as follows:

TABLE 2.—Progress of REA program by fiscal years

Fiscal year	Loan authorizations	Total loans approved	Miles to be constructed (loan estimate)	Consumers to be connected (loan estimate)	Funds advanced	Energized systems		
						Number	Miles	Consumers connected
1935-36	\$13,928,288	\$13,903,412	13,072	48,997	\$823,262	11	400	693
1937	46,500,000	58,936,217	54,407	193,529	11,864,836	45	8,000	19,611
1938	30,000,000	88,172,436	80,951	282,802	60,040,810	248	41,736	104,528
1939	140,000,000	227,236,949	209,818	724,999	122,337,824	417	115,230	268,000
1940	40,000,000	268,972,949	251,642	854,828	221,287,287	630	232,978	549,604
1941	100,000,000	369,027,621	356,053	1,171,867	296,395,142	732	307,769	779,561
1942	100,000,000	460,180,345	409,490	1,345,107	354,616,010	789	369,129	981,193
1943	10,000,000	466,881,323	414,287	1,358,114	369,152,582	805	381,747	1,041,821
1944	20,000,000	498,811,447	448,889	1,438,567	387,630,670	815	397,861	1,152,031
1945	25,000,000	564,968,184	507,105	1,581,431	427,566,738	832	424,072	1,287,347
1946	300,000,000	817,086,980	674,742	2,088,127	514,819,844	856	474,837	1,549,057
1947	250,000,000	1,068,436,162	811,019	2,484,503	704,905,701	889	546,781	1,843,351
1948	225,000,000	1,190,527,346	1,860,069	2,630,499	1,821,142,824	1,290	1,594,000	2,030,000
Total	1,300,428,288							

¹ As of Dec. 31, 1947.

² Estimated.

TABLE 3.—Progress of REA program since end of war, by States, June 30, 1945, to Dec. 31, 1947

Area	Total loans approved		Miles to be constructed (loan estimate)		Consumers to be connected (loan estimate)		Funds advanced		Number of energized systems		Number of miles energized		Number of consumers connected	
	June 30, 1945	Dec. 31, 1947	June 30, 1945	Dec. 31, 1947	June 30, 1945	Dec. 31, 1947	June 30, 1945	Dec. 31, 1947	June 30, 1945	Nov. 30, 1947	June 30, 1945	Nov. 30, 1947	June 30, 1945	Nov. 30, 1947
United States	\$504,968,184	\$1,190,527,346	507,105	860,069	1,581,431	2,630,499	\$427,566,738	\$821,142,824	832	902	424,072	585,686	1,287,347	1,992,052
Alabama	15,593,649	36,537,649	11,904	23,939	46,263	92,998	10,246,747	19,955,720	22	24	10,792	14,588	41,582	65,092
Arizona	1,326,000	5,085,786	849	2,203	3,025	7,091	1,160,134	3,140,263	3	7	632	762	2,236	3,980
Arkansas	14,961,500	32,223,000	13,085	24,629	44,736	83,127	9,749,265	22,419,086	17	19	9,693	15,209	31,074	58,721
California	2,469,500	3,142,429	1,755	2,020	5,636	5,599	1,920,262	2,409,330	4	5	1,502	1,718	4,507	7,257
Colorado	11,974,810	21,998,551	10,498	15,210	29,704	39,891	8,456,274	15,216,359	19	20	7,045	9,835	20,343	29,145
Connecticut	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware	1,113,000	17,116,000	1,053	1,486	3,374	6,426	1,033,266	1,742,835	1	1	1,002	1,082	3,173	3,869
Florida	5,824,500	2,127,000	11,733	15,856	35,747	3,830,560	12,045,032	14	17	3,846	7,194	12,592	23,214	23,214
Georgia	24,698,202	52,561,330	22,105	41,673	86,541	132,936	16,818,590	31,088,359	42	43	21,261	28,473	76,282	120,069
Idaho	4,184,750	7,682,515	3,162	5,207	9,443	13,326	3,398,264	5,438,742	9	9	3,083	3,601	7,503	9,439
Illinois	23,449,803	42,613,803	22,452	33,551	65,007	88,400	21,242,482	34,109,899	28	28	21,149	26,708	58,812	80,262
Indiana	24,883,269	37,922,726	24,152	31,431	84,067	112,972	27,675,561	47,550,136	44	54	22,735	27,018	77,688	101,621
Iowa	32,657,198	68,602,949	31,948	46,095	77,838	112,413	47,550,136	77,550,136	53	54	22,735	27,018	77,688	101,621
Kansas	12,564,151	38,613,351	12,867	29,722	28,720	57,861	8,760,517	23,195,058	22	28	9,844	14,378	19,514	30,127
Kentucky	18,433,855	41,416,855	16,200	29,498	64,159	115,323	12,499,547	26,525,944	25	25	13,780	17,877	52,128	78,701
Louisiana	12,644,100	21,255,600	8,905	14,057	29,397	52,743	10,173,149	18,176,164	15	15	7,143	11,707	22,883	45,157
Maine	762,500	1,198,500	564	746	2,309	2,990	600,069	1,011,219	4	4	471	489	1,297	2,192
Maryland	3,537,500	6,043,500	2,720	3,694	10,090	13,960	2,608,704	4,539,393	2	2	1,680	2,566	5,130	12,524
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan	14,872,500	23,289,221	10,315	13,107	35,287	48,801	13,092,358	17,705,155	13	13	9,784	10,965	34,053	43,586
Minnesota	36,172,807	72,001,257	34,415	55,545	82,619	131,088	28,446,895	49,633,602	49	50	30,985	40,731	70,658	97,960
Mississippi	15,273,953	40,384,953	15,083	31,235	54,152	126,717	11,845,597	25,173,768	23	23	14,649	21,489	53,652	96,567
Missouri	33,114,200	66,535,825	29,756	47,122	97,391	151,573	22,624,274	47,011,114	38	41	20,964	30,698	64,063	100,822
Montana	5,404,598	17,718,598	4,868	11,882	11,959	23,667	3,270,356	11,327,432	12	20	3,259	5,785	7,764	15,878
Nebraska	16,191,663	40,439,263	14,944	30,982	33,828	64,789	12,206,565	23,401,230	22	24	11,910	16,255	24,195	35,967
Nevada	259,000	296,000	115	130	522	536	231,660	253,063	1	2	121	147	461	667
New Hampshire	1,674,000	2,189,000	1,474	1,821	4,564	4,891	1,459,282	2,036,707	1	1	1,373	1,580	2,792	4,243
New Jersey	568,500	688,500	411	502	1,528	2,040	511,490	642,803	2	2	412	451	1,601	2,008
New Mexico	2,673,500	9,419,000	2,303	6,110	6,622	15,678	1,574,984	5,907,333	6	10	1,362	2,716	3,645	8,426
New York	4,358,618	4,787,618	4,097	3,990	13,814	13,526	3,533,176	4,071,483	6	6	2,483	2,888	8,544	10,185
North Carolina	24,456,852	41,886,152	18,976	26,623	71,145	106,380	15,296,934	29,815,971	35	35	12,256	17,919	45,756	75,674
North Dakota	5,241,472	30,155,972	4,607	18,274	10,116	28,558	3,765,712	17,163,734	7	12	3,212	6,104	6,682	10,963
Ohio	27,410,301	33,467,580	23,500	24,997	85,651	95,727	20,330,286	28,410,880	28	28	18,920	22,928	64,506	86,100
Oklahoma	16,566,506	37,788,506	16,938	30,905	45,075	77,761	12,613,424	27,419,994	23	24	13,700	21,734	32,729	54,634
Oregon	6,917,000	11,611,184	4,958	6,456	15,160	19,118	3,997,088	8,585,665	13	13	2,638	4,260	9,684	15,019
Pennsylvania	12,639,200	17,104,200	10,855	13,469	36,207	46,539	10,831,886	14,581,903	13	13	10,091	12,321	32,901	45,008
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	11,225,719	24,562,269	12,362	20,625	43,671	70,929	8,675,928	16,172,773	23	23	10,939	14,528	35,309	55,730
South Dakota	3,801,154	22,044,154	4,044	16,572	8,876	33,378	2,142,607	11,446,091	7	16	2,308	4,479	4,791	12,798
Tennessee	15,054,861	37,718,608	12,165	27,544	71,861	156,331	12,926,172	25,155,704	29	30	11,479	17,026	77,171	130,913
Texas	47,873,574	101,325,074	50,489	88,860	128,191	218,737	35,173,788	76,820,607	71	75	41,609	62,387	104,216	168,765
Utah	1,515,000	2,202,000	917	1,164	2,936	3,608	1,093,393	1,521,606	3	5	687	930	2,455	3,018
Vermont	1,686,000	2,784,000	1,437	1,790	4,322	4,919	1,185,229	2,143,520	3	3	1,049	1,462	2,871	4,142
Virginia	12,688,356	27,508,242	10,722	17,882	33,943	58,930	10,094,078	22,095,899	16	16	9,081	13,414	27,641	48,051
Washington	8,600,611	16,236,611	7,674	11,635	17,176	24,891	6,483,448	10,751,691	19	21	6,120	7,894	13,679	18,274
West Virginia	727,000	952,000	593	618	2,032	2,549	687,715	856,720	2	2	538	606	1,694	2,340
Wisconsin	22,377,952	58,712,615	16,179	26,808	46,297	80,631	19,103,919	35,784,958	30	32	15,792	19,776	42,147	57,233
Wyoming	3,902,000	8,590,600	3,538	6,163	8,459	11,936	2,660,048	5,403,243	12	14	2,280	3,246	5,893	8,205
Alaska	488,000	1,555,000	111	279	703	1,665	421,271	450,634	2	2	111	119	780	1,015
Virgin Islands	275,000	432,000	100	85	1,159	912	273,572	319,772	1	1	52	55	449	516
Transfer adjustment							200,000	200,000						

NOTE.—State figures represent data for REA borrowers incorporated within the State.

TABLE 4.—Number of miles energized by REA borrowers, by States, by fiscal years, 1938-47¹

Area	Nov. 30, 1947	June 30, 1947	June 30, 1946	June 30, 1945	June 30, 1944	June 30, 1943	June 30, 1942	June 30, 1941	June 30, 1940	June 30, 1939	June 30, 1938
United States.....	585,686	546,781	474,837	424,072	397,861	381,747	369,129	307,769	232,078	115,230	41,736
Alabama.....	14,588	13,259	11,473	10,792	10,096	9,833	9,309	8,042	5,694	2,935	1,574
Arizona.....	762	736	640	632	632	618	655	451	193	117	117
Arkansas.....	15,209	14,302	11,574	9,693	9,182	9,024	8,677	6,864	5,398	1,464	98
California.....	1,718	1,683	1,607	1,502	1,465	1,464	1,464	1,467	1,435	1,249	0
Colorado.....	9,835	9,273	7,941	7,045	6,265	5,869	5,331	3,794	2,469	1,026	170
Connecticut.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware.....	1,082	1,056	1,047	1,002	1,001	985	985	920	847	371	302
Florida.....	7,194	6,133	4,662	3,846	3,772	3,663	3,291	2,514	2,012	538	0
Georgia.....	28,473	26,543	22,632	21,261	20,802	20,502	20,358	18,361	14,583	8,290	2,915
Idaho.....	3,601	3,430	3,243	3,083	3,045	2,931	2,917	2,385	1,734	669	161
Illinois.....	26,708	24,961	22,401	21,149	19,980	19,234	19,011	15,304	12,947	2,393	746
Indiana.....	27,018	25,474	23,500	22,755	22,355	21,968	21,563	19,288	16,235	8,372	3,972
Iowa.....	38,088	36,026	32,557	28,030	25,020	23,612	23,462	20,169	14,532	7,719	2,574
Kansas.....	14,378	12,590	10,527	9,844	9,463	9,308	8,954	6,880	4,692	1,343	101
Kentucky.....	17,877	16,728	14,828	13,780	13,173	12,620	11,814	9,634	8,014	4,824	1,177
Louisiana.....	11,707	10,899	8,677	7,143	5,888	5,602	5,103	3,805	2,938	1,295	630
Maine.....	489	489	477	471	384	383	373	231	65	65	0
Maryland.....	2,566	2,487	2,079	1,680	1,654	1,637	1,570	620	475	227	0
Massachusetts.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan.....	10,965	10,711	10,082	9,784	9,539	9,466	9,388	9,142	8,232	6,477	501
Minnesota.....	40,731	38,524	34,741	30,985	28,238	26,852	25,996	21,222	16,216	9,662	3,431
Mississippi.....	21,489	20,515	16,491	14,649	13,549	13,167	12,902	11,507	8,529	3,028	826
Missouri.....	30,698	28,890	24,951	20,964	18,997	17,107	16,653	13,008	9,016	2,880	1,555
Montana.....	5,785	4,895	3,795	3,259	3,094	3,040	2,992	2,407	1,966	1,178	588
Nebraska.....	16,255	15,398	13,331	11,910	10,997	10,247	9,924	8,860	7,411	4,802	2,097
Nevada.....	147	144	121	121	112	112	112	109	107	103	0
New Hampshire.....	1,580	1,547	1,427	1,373	1,373	1,373	1,373	623	97	0	0
New Jersey.....	451	448	437	412	399	390	355	352	347	307	201
New Mexico.....	2,416	2,433	1,641	1,362	1,264	1,242	914	784	628	315	0
New York.....	2,888	2,852	2,773	2,483	1,494	1,390	1,390	1,390	1,054	0	0
North Carolina.....	17,919	16,338	13,605	12,256	11,927	11,811	11,338	9,508	6,258	1,832	474
North Dakota.....	6,104	5,062	3,673	3,212	3,039	2,764	2,492	1,919	1,351	650	350
Ohio.....	22,928	22,120	20,265	18,920	18,648	17,914	16,617	15,392	12,912	8,540	4,975
Oklahoma.....	21,734	20,319	17,277	13,700	12,118	11,312	11,090	9,433	7,128	3,012	1,151
Oregon.....	4,260	3,897	3,281	2,838	2,424	2,348	2,270	1,211	439	244	0
Pennsylvania.....	12,321	12,006	10,593	10,061	9,674	9,217	8,977	7,990	5,832	3,473	1,009
Rhode Island.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina.....	14,528	13,634	11,690	10,939	10,418	10,208	10,188	7,366	4,439	1,719	1,002
South Dakota.....	4,479	3,643	2,556	2,308	2,262	2,156	2,069	1,398	592	430	176
Tennessee.....	17,026	15,974	14,162	11,479	11,244	11,039	10,201	7,573	4,163	3,169	1,929
Texas.....	62,387	56,694	48,479	41,609	39,157	37,198	35,691	29,645	21,941	8,606	1,693
Utah.....	930	920	879	687	646	646	670	645	407	0	0
Vermont.....	1,462	1,389	1,210	1,049	996	964	812	607	167	54	0
Virginia.....	13,414	12,206	10,302	9,081	8,869	8,424	8,348	7,180	5,791	3,406	684
Washington.....	7,394	7,445	6,471	6,120	5,696	5,505	5,353	3,567	2,001	1,151	486
West Virginia.....	606	595	560	538	538	430	430	430	401	273	0
Wisconsin.....	19,776	18,875	17,465	15,792	14,744	13,884	13,772	11,607	10,111	6,366	3,777
Wyoming.....	3,246	3,065	2,546	2,280	2,078	2,042	2,006	1,665	1,239	656	293
Alaska.....	119	118	116	111	98	95	14	0	0	0	0
Virgin Islands.....	55	55	52	52	52	51	55	0	0	0	0

¹ Data not available for prior years.

NOTE.—State figures represent data for REA borrowers incorporated within the State.

TABLE 5.—Number of consumers connected by REA borrowers, by States, by fiscal years, 1940-47¹

Area	Nov. 30, 1947	June 30, 1947	June 30, 1946	June 30, 1945	June 30, 1944	June 30, 1943	June 30, 1942	June 30, 1941	June 30, 1940
United States.....	1,992,052	1,843,351	1,549,057	1,287,347	1,152,031	1,041,821	981,193	779,561	549,604
Alabama.....	65,092	59,693	48,855	41,582	34,977	31,972	30,170	22,936	12,619
Arizona.....	3,980	3,751	2,439	2,236	2,011	1,923	1,152	923	427
Arkansas.....	58,721	52,186	40,659	31,074	27,143	24,932	22,717	16,376	11,175
California.....	7,257	5,140	4,697	4,507	4,237	4,158	3,990	3,674	3,255
Colorado.....	29,145	27,987	24,210	20,343	17,310	13,748	12,034	8,106	5,163
Connecticut.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware.....	3,469	3,633	3,173	3,046	2,883	2,810	2,413	1,939	1,399
Florida.....	25,214	21,974	16,837	12,592	10,907	9,413	8,374	5,774	4,213
Georgia.....	120,069	109,562	89,015	76,282	69,459	64,399	61,329	52,644	39,226
Idaho.....	9,439	8,892	7,880	7,503	7,365	6,322	5,051	3,671	2,571
Illinois.....	100,262	74,888	66,379	58,812	53,491	49,649	48,401	36,602	28,155
Indiana.....	101,621	95,437	85,025	77,688	73,274	68,640	67,035	55,935	45,071
Iowa.....	94,915	90,074	79,693	67,831	59,153	53,495	51,802	42,037	29,189
Kansas.....	30,127	26,807	22,366	19,514	17,700	16,627	15,374	11,256	7,611
Kentucky.....	78,701	72,629	61,400	52,128	46,765	41,957	34,496	26,248	20,854
Louisiana.....	45,157	40,671	30,740	22,883	17,238	14,971	13,055	9,627	6,979
Maine.....	2,192	2,099	1,905	1,297	1,088	1,048	948	616	177
Maryland.....	12,524	11,476	9,101	5,130	4,717	4,440	4,075	2,317	1,376
Massachusetts.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan.....	43,586	41,144	37,726	34,053	31,778	30,082	29,688	26,520	20,887
Minnesota.....	97,960	91,516	80,998	70,658	62,999	56,955	54,250	42,493	31,941
Mississippi.....	96,567	90,430	65,668	53,652	46,437	42,688	41,622	39,300	27,598
Missouri.....	109,822	102,671	85,821	64,063	54,984	39,594	37,173	26,528	17,588
Montana.....	15,878	14,255	11,803	7,764	7,374	7,027	6,870	5,720	4,284
Nebraska.....	35,967	33,545	28,961	24,195	20,937	18,399	17,266	14,218	11,200
Nevada.....	667	645	518	461	442	431	443	392	417
New Hampshire.....	4,243	3,942	3,304	2,792	2,691	2,630	2,614	1,156	194
New Jersey.....	2,008	1,944	1,780	1,601	1,444	1,388	1,413	1,200	1,041
New Mexico.....	8,426	7,442	6,011	3,645	2,820	2,547	2,004	1,596	1,014
New York.....	10,185	10,040	9,540	8,544	6,618	6,400	5,720	5,720	3,876
North Carolina.....	75,674	68,341	54,910	45,756	41,061	38,441	35,449	27,131	18,815
North Dakota.....	10,963	9,602	7,570	6,682	6,215	5,514	4,961	3,646	2,610
Ohio.....	86,100	82,558	72,728	64,506	62,311	58,260	50,666	44,030	36,026
Oklahoma.....	54,634	51,131	42,191	32,729	27,929	22,774	22,225	17,516	12,378
Oregon.....	15,019	14,039	11,461	9,684	7,501	6,892	6,177	3,288	1,509
Pennsylvania.....	45,008	42,512	38,015	32,901	30,569	28,520	27,123	22,069	15,143
Rhode Island.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina.....	55,730	50,448	41,622	35,309	31,913	29,655	28,904	20,650	13,962
South Dakota.....	12,798	11,348	5,355	4,791	4,402	3,852	3,606	2,400	1,015
Tennessee.....	130,913	120,824	104,633	77,171	71,475	67,698	63,046	48,781	18,978

¹ Data not available for prior years.

TABLE 5.—Number of consumers connected by REA borrowers, by States, by fiscal years, 1940-47—Continued

Area	Nov. 30, 1947	June 30, 1947	June 30, 1946	June 30, 1945	June 30, 1944	June 30, 1943	June 30, 1942	June 30, 1941	June 30, 1940
Texas.....	168,765	154,640	128,505	104,216	92,176	82,110	79,492	61,524	43,376
Utah.....	3,018	2,899	2,896	2,455	2,263	2,190	1,790	1,691	1,035
Vermont.....	4,142	3,949	3,262	2,871	2,635	2,506	1,905	1,230	443
Virginia.....	48,051	43,248	34,126	27,641	25,490	23,687	23,495	19,235	14,419
Washington.....	18,274	17,651	15,819	13,679	12,591	11,708	11,154	7,918	4,364
West Virginia.....	2,340	2,165	1,976	1,684	1,543	1,267	1,240	1,164	897
Wisconsin.....	57,293	54,311	49,371	42,147	37,235	32,922	32,066	26,417	20,866
Wyoming.....	5,205	7,739	6,446	5,893	5,255	4,718	4,304	3,493	2,625
Alaska.....	1,015	7,957	879	780	682	522	28	0	0
Virgin Islands.....	516	516	493	449	374	497	464	0	0

NOTE.—State figures represent data for REA borrowers incorporated within the State.

TABLE 6.—Loan allocations, by type of borrower and purpose, as of Dec. 11, 1948

Type of borrower	Number of borrowers	Total amount	Distribution systems	Generation and trans- mission	Consumer facilities
Cooperatives.....	947	\$1,141,230,747	\$1,000,914,190	\$127,474,434	\$12,842,123
Public power districts.....	41	39,400,641	37,675,441	1,129,850	595,350
Other public bodies.....	20	4,776,695	4,682,004	94,691	0
Power companies.....	21	5,119,263	4,481,763	637,500	0
All.....	1,029	1,190,527,346	1,047,753,398	129,336,475	13,437,473

Mr. LANGER. Mr. Wickard continued:

In addition to making self-liquidating loans and supervising the construction of the facilities that constitute the only security for these Federal funds, REA has the responsibility for safeguarding these loans through advice and assistance to borrowers, since the real security of the Government in these loan investments is based not only on the proper construction of these facilities but on their satisfactory and efficient operation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the testimony of Mr. Claude Wickard be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the remainder of Mr. Wickard's testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the outset, the boards of directors, and in many cases the managers, have had no previous experience in operating an electric utility. They are willing to undertake the responsibility of learning as a means of providing themselves with an essential service that they could not obtain in any other way. Any failure of REA to give them competent guidance would practically block the potentialities opened up by making rural electrification loan funds available.

From the beginning of their contacts with borrowers, REA personnel are instructed to operate on the basis that each electric co-op is an independent, locally owned, business enterprise, whose owners, officers, and local management have the primary responsibility for its success. Strong emphasis is placed on encouraging pride of ownership among the members. New directors and new managers are encouraged to assume their full responsibilities rapidly. As they develop in confidence and ability, they are asked to work out independently the proportionately larger number of their own problems.

Currently, the greater part of REA's management assistance is going to a relatively small number of borrowers. During the 1947 fiscal year, for example, we found that the group of borrowers receiving the bulk of management assistance was composed largely of the approximate 5 percent that experienced trouble meeting their interest and principal payments, and approximately an equal number which showed trends toward financial difficulties and needed good counsel to stay on their feet.

I might mention the auditing of co-op books, as an example of a management responsibility formerly performed wholly by REA, but now performed in part by the co-ops. Until this year the accounts of all

borrowers were audited entirely by members of the REA field staff. This has now been changed, and co-ops which meet certain standards of maturity will in the future be asked to assume responsibility for having their general accounts audited periodically by certified public accountants of their own choice.

I have already indicated that the type of operation REA uses has been quite effective in getting electric service extended to rural people. It is proper for this committee to inquire, too, just how effective REA's program of management assistance to borrowers has been, and whether or not the Government has got its money's worth from the personnel assigned to this work. The effectiveness of management assistance is not always easy to measure, but the financial record of the REA borrowers is certainly an indication. This record, which has been consistently good since the start of the program, is given in some detail in the table No. 7. To mention here only the highlights, let me point out that through December 31, 1947, REA had advanced \$821,000,000 as loans to its borrowers. As of the same date, the borrowers had repaid almost \$87,000,000 of principal and had paid over \$67,000,000 in interest. Payments included more than \$23,000,000 paid on principal in advance of the time it was due. Only \$949,000 was more than 30 days overdue. There has been only one foreclosure in the history of the program.

To summarize what I have just been saying, the REA program consists basically of making loans, protecting the security of these loans, and providing such management assistance to borrowers as is essential to the carrying out of the objectives of the Rural Electrification Act. I believe that this committee, with its concern for Government personnel and administrative matters, will be interested in knowing how REA is organized to do the job I have outlined.

The REA staff currently numbers about 925 persons, of whom 680 are employed in Washington and 245 in the field. REA has no field offices. For administrative purposes, the country is divided into 10 geographical regions, but the office for each region is in the Washington headquarters. I have here a map showing the REA regions.

We have four "line" divisions. These are the divisions that have the most direct contact with borrowers.

The function of the Applications and Loans Division is to assist borrowers with the preparation of their applications for loans, to study all applications, and to recommend for my approval those which are found to be feasible. It is also responsible for assistance to borrowers in connection with boundary studies, area coverage surveys, and other planning activities essential if a co-op is to

extend service to every potential consumer in its service area. In this Division, too, lies responsibility for encouraging borrowers to undertake programs of wiring, lighting, and power-use education, with the aim of helping rural people to get maximum benefit from their electric service. In view of the varied duties of this Division, its personnel have a variety of backgrounds. Most of them have had agricultural training, some as economists, some as agricultural engineers, some as county agents. A few are electrical engineers.

The Engineering Division is responsible for all REA activities pertaining to engineering advice and assistance to borrowers in the design, construction, and technical operation of rural electric systems. It is this division, for example, which approves the preliminary plans and specifications for a line-construction job before a loan is made and which passes on completed construction before funds are advanced to pay for the work. Another of its major responsibilities is to assist borrowers with system engineering studies which are essential to their area coverage planning. The professional people in this division are chiefly electrical engineers.

The third line division, the Management Division, is responsible for helping REA borrowers to become efficiently run electric service businesses. Its responsibility begins when a co-op's first lines are energized and covers such management fields as organization, budgets, operating costs, power sources, personnel training, labor relations and others. This division is headed by a man who had done an outstanding job managing an REA-financed co-op and is staffed largely by persons with management experience and training.

The other line division is the Finance Division, which advises borrowers on their accounting problems, audits accounts of borrowers, and maintains the official loan accounts and records of the agency. Its key personnel are trained accountants.

In addition to these four line divisions, we have four staff divisions. The Technical Standards Division is a small division made up chiefly of electrical and agricultural engineers who assist the staff on technical problems relating to the development of system specifications and equipment standards. The Information Services Division prepares reports to the public on rural electrification progress and assists the staff and borrowers with problems in the field of cooperative and power-use education. The Personnel Division handles internal personnel affairs of the agency and also advises on personnel problems in connection with management of borrowers' systems. The Administrative Services Division is our housekeeping division.

REA has no legal division but relies for legal work on the Department of Agriculture Solicitor's Office, which has an associate solicitor and a small staff assigned to rural electrification work. These lawyers perform a number of essential functions in connection with our program. One that I might mention is the drawing up of the loan contracts between REA and its borrowers.

So much for the organization and early history of the REA program. I would like to mention briefly the wartime activities of

the agency as background for a discussion of the problems currently being faced by the REA staff.

By 1941, the new approach to rural electrification problems had proved itself beyond question and pointed the way for much more rapid expansion. But at that time the Nation had to devote much of the critical materials and manpower which power lines require to the urgent task of national defense and thereafter to winning the war. Large-scale expansion of rural power lines had to be postponed.

In some cases material which had originally been intended for the extension of electric service had to be diverted to the military effort. Two generating units being installed by the Dairyland Power Cooperative were requisitioned by the Navy for Caribbean bastion. Wire already delivered to a contractor building a cooperative transmission network in Texas was diverted to supplying munitions producers. The Dairyland Power Cooperative was unable to install substitute generators until 1946.

During the war, however, the importance to the National welfare of electricity on farms became so apparent that the connection of farms with critical production problems, that electrical equipment would help to solve, was authorized under special regulations of the War Production Board.

The U-1-C order of WPB permitted line extensions of 5,000 feet or less to farms with animal units sufficient to guarantee increased production of livestock, dairy and poultry products through the use of electricity. Under this regulation REA borrowers connected more than 200,000 farms.

Events following the lifting of materials restrictions in 1945 soon justified the expectations of those who had predicted a major expansion. The insistent demands from farmers for electric service caused us to raise our sights. Before the war our operations were geared to a program of loans of \$40,000,000 a year, although congressional authorizations had reached a peak of \$140,000,000 in 1 year. In the first postwar year loan authorizations totaled \$300,000,000. Loans approved from funds for the first two fiscal years after VE-day exceeded the total approved during all the preceding 10 years of REA history.

Along with every other agency, we expected some delay in our program before materials would again flow for rural line construction at prewar rates. It was not until 1947 that the materials, ordered by reason of greatly increased REA loan approvals, began to be delivered in quantities comparable to prewar levels, although still greatly below the postwar demands.

The calendar year 1947 was the biggest year in several important aspects. The rate of construction reached a new high almost every month, and is now the fastest yet attained in rural-electrification expansion.

REA borrowers brought central station electric service to 346,000 farms and other rural establishments in the calendar year 1947. This is 71,000 more consumers than they added to their systems in the previous peak year of 1946, and 87,000 above their prewar record which was established in 1939.

Funds advanced by REA to finance the construction program of the borrowers amounted to more than \$225,000,000. This exceeded by about \$93,000,000 the funds advanced in any previous year. The great expansion in the rate of progress of the REA program has quite naturally resulted in increased demands upon our limited personnel.

In addition to 87,000 miles of distribution lines that were energized during the year, the construction program included the "heavying-up" of many miles of lines to handle increased loads. It also included the construction of additional generating and transmission facilities.

Advances of funds under the provisions of loan contracts during the last half of 1947 was approximately equal to the amount of new loans approved. As the supply of materials improves, advances will exceed new ap-

provals until the backlog of committed funds has been reduced to the amount required by normal construction operations.

Along with the tremendous growth in the number of farms and other rural establishments connected in 1947 to each REA-financed system, REA borrowers were faced—and still are faced—with the problem of obtaining an adequate power supply to meet the demands of new consumers as well as the greatly increased demands of old consumers.

To illustrate the increased demand for power, the total energy usable on REA-financed lines has increased nearly fivefold since before the war, although the number of consumers served has only doubled.

Despite the progress that has been made in rural electrification and contrary to the public statements of the program's detractors, a tremendous job lies ahead. More than 2,000,000 farms in this country do not yet have electric service. Farmers without service want and need it. Although the Congress has authorized loan funds for REA in large amounts since the war, the backlog of loan applications that could not be filled because of lack of funds has continued to grow. In the summer of 1945, REA had a backlog of loan applications on hand or in process in the field of slightly more than \$200,000,000. The backlog today is \$267,000,000 in spite of loan approvals amounting to almost \$630,000,000 in the interval.

Some idea of the demand for electric service on the part of farmers in various sections of the country can be obtained from table 8, which shows by States the amount of loan applications on hand or in preparation in the field, as of January 7, 1948.

One of the reasons why the job ahead in rural electrification is so complex is that a great part of the power system construction remaining to be done is in the Great Plains States. Because the economy of those areas is primarily agricultural, their need for electric service is great. But because of extremely low average consumer density and other difficulties, the areas involve serious problems for any power distributor. Progress in these areas was extremely slow before the war. Today, the special problems are being solved and REA borrowers have a tremendous program under way in these sections of the country.

The acceleration of the REA program in the Great Plains States began in about 1944. It stemmed from three principal factors:

First, in 1944 a policy aimed at applying area-wide electrification to all sections of the country was initiated on an aggressive scale.

Second, more favorable financing terms were made available through enactment of the Pace Act.

Third, out of almost 10 years of rural electrification came experience that pointed the way for bringing service to the less densely settled areas on a feasible basis.

As a result of this combination of factors, scores of new rural electric co-ops have been organized in the Great Plains States since 1944—14 in the State of North Dakota alone, for example.

These new co-ops, together with the few established earlier in the REA program, are taking a businesslike approach to the problem of bringing electric service to all rural consumers in their service areas. First, the co-ops make boundary studies to help them estimate how far their lines can reasonably be extended; second, area surveys are made on a farm-to-farm and house-to-house basis to determine how many rural establishments within those boundaries still do not have central station electric service; third, system engineering studies are made as a basis for electric systems fully adequate to meet the needs of all consumers to be served.

As they develop their rural power systems, the leaders of these rural electric co-ops are finding that the farmers of the Great Plains States are tremendous users of power. For example, the estimated farm consumption on one system in North Dakota, Nodak

Rural Electric Cooperative, of Grand Forks, increased from 100 kilowatt-hours per month in 1941 to 300 kilowatt-hours in 1947. Another North Dakota co-op estimates that its consumers who were using 175 kilowatt-hours per month on an average in 1946, will be using 300 kilowatt-hours in 1948. Average monthly farm consumption of power on all REA-financed lines in North Dakota increased from 90.4 kilowatt-hours in December 1941 to 168.2 kilowatt-hours in December 1946. The 1947 figure is expected to be much higher and the 1948 figure higher still.

Still another factor in the electrification of the sparsely settled rural areas has been the cooperation of town and country people. In some areas the rural electric co-ops and the towns and villages integrated their power facilities into larger systems. This practice has enabled the co-ops to reach out still further into unelectrified farm areas and attain area coverage. Almost invariably the co-op members and the townspeople benefited from the mergers.

One effect of all of this activity has been a great increase in the amount of REA loans for rural electrification in the Great Plains States. In the early years of the program the loan applications submitted from many of the Plains States were barely sufficient to exhaust the loan funds set aside for those States under the State-allotment provision of the Rural Electrification Act. Today the applications from those States surpass by far the total amount that can be made available to them from both the allotted and the discretionary portions of the year's loan fund. During the first 10 years of the program, for instance, loans to borrowers in North Dakota totaled \$5,200,000. During fiscal 1946 and 1947, however, approximately \$25,000,000 was allocated in that State. Similar increases were noted in other States in the Great Plains area.

These loan funds are now being converted into power lines to serve farmers. The number of farms electrified in the Great Plains States already shows substantial improvement. In the State of North Dakota, 5,300 new consumers were connected to REA-financed lines between July 1, 1945, and the present. This brings the total number of consumers served by the North Dakota co-ops to 12,030. When all funds already allocated to the co-ops in North Dakota have been converted into rural power lines it is estimated that farm electrification in the State will approach 50 percent.

This acceleration in activities could not have been achieved without special attention by REA to the less populated areas. Because the rural-electrification problems of these areas are more complex and because the rural-electrification program is new to the people there, REA has given a great deal of special advice and assistance to the REA co-ops in the Great Plains States. The line divisions give attention to region VI—North and South Dakota and Minnesota—to the full extent that the personnel situation permits. Five field representatives of one division, however, have resigned their positions in this region in the last 6 months. New and inexperienced personnel must be trained for the jobs.

Unfortunately, many of the thinly populated areas, in addition to being afflicted with the problems I have just been talking about, are also among the sections of the country in which the shortage of power is the most acute. These areas sometimes abound in the natural sources of power, but facilities for power production have simply not been developed rapidly enough to keep pace with the needs of rural people, who until recent years had little hope of ever getting electric service.

Except where there are large public power developments, there have been two main sources of power for the rural electric co-ops of the West. These have been municipalities and power companies which have sold power to the co-ops at wholesale. These

sources were adequate for the needs of infant rural power systems but they have now been outgrown in many cases.

One of the services of REA to the rural electric co-ops of the Great Plains States has been to assist them in locating new sources of power and in obtaining more favorable wholesale power rates that have made possible electrification of many areas. In a few cases, REA has been able to make loans for generation plants or transmission lines, or both, to Plains State borrowers when reasonable rates could not be obtained, or power supplies were not available, to meet the needs.

One example is the Minnkota Power Cooperative of Grand Forks, N. Dak., which was organized early in 1940 to serve four REA-financed electric distribution cooperatives in North Dakota and five in Minnesota. Currently it is serving seven of the cooperatives through generating and transmission facilities it constructed. Its two Diesel-power-generating plants have a combined installed capacity of 9,960 kilowatts.

Minnkota operates 385 miles of transmission lines. It has under construction additional transmission lines and 10,000 kilowatts of additional generating capacity. These additional facilities will provide power for the two member cooperatives not yet receiving service and a more adequate supply of power for those now served. The present facilities have been outgrown and expansion of the member distribution systems is necessarily slowed down.

Minnkota Power Cooperative has supplied power where it was not otherwise available and in a region that commercial power companies once considered unfeasible to electrify.

Here is another instance of the efforts REA is making to assist rural people in solving their power problem. Since the war REA has approved a loan to a commercial power company to install new transmission-line capacity to bring low-cost Bureau of Reclamation power into wide areas of western North Dakota where power supplies are inadequate.

Any description of the rural-electrification program would be incomplete if I failed to point out that in many areas the program has reached a state of development in which miles of new line, or number of new consumers, no longer provide an adequate criterion of progress. Consumption of electricity is increasing tremendously. Many co-ops of moderate size have seen their loads grow to gigantic proportions. The need for system strengthening has become just as imperative as the need for extending electric service to the many rural families still without it.

Rural electrification progress of the future must be measured in terms of ability to give good service as much as by the number of new connections. Old lines frequently must be rephased to enable them to carry more energy. Additional substations often are required, as well as larger transformers in existing substations. New transmission lines, and in some cases new generation facilities, are vitally needed by many co-ops. Such improvements to existing service do not always show up in terms of new consumers connected. They are hard to measure by conventional yardsticks. Nevertheless they have become a vital part of program progress. And they require annually an increasing amount of the REA loan fund.

There have been predictions that the position of rural electrification would be weakened materially if full prosperity failed to continue, with plans for expansion coming to a standstill, rural consumers greatly curtailing their use of electricity or even terminating service, and co-ops finding themselves unable to meet their loan obligations. REA does not share this view. Regardless of future economic conditions, whether hard times threaten or good times remain, the contribution of rural power will be vital. The history of the few rural electric systems in operation during the depression of the early 1930's shows that their patrons continued to lean heavily on electric power to aid the efficiency and volume of their production; that they were in a more favorable economic position because they had electricity available; and that the organizations supplying them with power faced no greater economic hardships than the average of other business institutions across the country.

In pushing ahead with the job of rural electrification, we must recognize the factors that will have a significant bearing on the future course of the program and the speed of its progress.

First of all, the Congress by its authorizations of loan funds will determine how soon service will be available to those rural people still without it and the extent to which service to all present consumers can be kept adequate and dependable.

Second, as industry's output of construction materials catches up with the tremendous postwar demand, rural power systems will be able to step up their line extensions.

Third, for many cooperatives the current or prospective inability to purchase sufficient power will be a handicap that must be overcome if rural electrification progress is not to be delayed before the job is finished.

Fourth, the safeguarding of the Government's loan investment in the program and the assurance of the program's effectiveness necessitate a staff adequate in numbers and qualified by training and experience to perform the changing functions of our agency in an efficient manner.

This last problem has a direct bearing on the future of the REA program, and I know it is a problem that is of concern to this committee, which has indicated its interest in efforts to attract and hold high-type personnel in the Government service.

For REA the job of administration has grown constantly as the program of rural electrification has progressed. By the end of this fiscal year, for example, it is expected that well over a billion dollars will have been advanced to REA borrowers, compared to \$221,000,000 up to June 1940. There will be half again as many borrowers in 1948 as in 1940. Miles of line on REA-financed systems will have increased some 200 percent and the number of consumers upward of 300 percent. These figures illustrate how the work load and responsibility of the agency increase as the electrification job goes forward.

The increase in the work load, together with this year's reduction of \$600,000 in the REA administrative appropriation, has necessitated a critical examination of every activity of the agency in an effort to get the best possible job done with the limited administrative funds available.

In order to operate within our budget, our personnel had to be reduced by 15 percent. The major part of the reduction, in compliance with the admonishment set forth in

the 1948 Senate Appropriations Committee report, was accomplished by the abolition of high-salaried positions. Altogether, 181 positions were eliminated, of which 46 carried salaries of \$5,000 or more.

Because of the feeling of insecurity growing out of the action of Congress last spring, and because of the low level of salaries we are able to offer, and other factors, we had 206 voluntary resignations and transfers between May 25 and December 31, 1947. Many of these people, some with years of experience in REA, left to take better paying or more secure positions elsewhere.

Qualified replacements have been difficult to obtain. On the first of January, the agency had approximately 100 vacancies. Of these, more than half are positions requiring people of professional training and experience.

Notwithstanding this unfortunate situation, I take great pride in the attitudes, qualifications, and accomplishments of the REA staff. Despite the problems that have arisen because of the loss of many of our experienced personnel, a high level of efficiency has been maintained as the record shows. It is significant to note that the over-all program of the agency is three times greater now than during the highest prewar year. Yet our staff is smaller than it was at the outbreak of the war. This year we have approximately one employee—including clerical as well as professional personnel—for each borrower. And yet the average allocation of Government funds, per cooperative, amounts to more than a million dollars.

REA's record is outstanding when compared with private banking institutions which have a comparable amount of loans outstanding. Its staff is smaller and its expenditures for salaries and wages are considerably less, while its responsibilities in making 100-percent loans are obviously more exacting.

It is fortunate for the cause of rural electrification and the Nation that we have such hard-working, capable, and efficient people on the staff of REA. Many of them have the opportunity to go elsewhere for better pay and greater opportunity, but are remaining because they believe their work in behalf of rural electrification is making such a worthwhile contribution to the welfare of rural people and the Nation.

Our personnel, like the millions of farm people who are learning to benefit from electrification, recognize electricity as a power that helps turn the wheels of progress. In today's world, electricity and power have come to mean practically one and the same thing. Always tireless, always on tap, electricity offers farmers greater opportunity for economical and diversified production than any other force available. It also offers to rural people the achievement of a modern standard of living with better facilities for health and for cultural progress than they have ever enjoyed before. Electricity, given its full opportunity, can be counted on to play a dynamic role in rural America's future.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in order to show the financial standing, borrowers' payments of interest and principal, and cumulative totals as of December 31, 1947, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks table No. 7.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 7.—Borrowers' payments of interest and principal—cumulative totals as of Dec. 31, 1947

Item	Distribution, transmission, and generation		Consumer facilities		Total, all loans		Total
	Interest	Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	Principal	
Amount due ¹	\$67,289,697.25	\$57,731,845.18	\$404,950.01	\$6,138,787.53	\$67,694,647.26	\$63,870,632.71	\$131,565,279.97
Amount paid ¹	66,779,155.75	80,601,356.87	398,204.28	6,093,665.93	67,177,360.03	86,695,022.80	153,872,382.83
Amounts overdue more than 30 days	570,894.00	321,108.97	6,579.88	50,642.36	577,473.88	371,751.33	949,225.21
Advance payments		23,282,077.44				23,282,077.44	23,282,077.44

¹ Includes amounts on notes declared due and paid in full by borrowers.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am sure that every Senator present will be interested in knowing the number of applications on hand and in process of preparation in the field as of January 7, 1948, so that at a glance they can tell exactly the amount of money which has been applied for in each one of the States. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that table No. 8 may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 8.—Applications on hand and in process of preparation in the field as of Jan. 7, 1948

Alabama.....	\$4,302,000
Arizona.....	1,050,000
Arkansas.....	5,143,000
California.....	100,000
Colorado.....	5,383,000
Delaware.....	150,000
Florida.....	5,825,000
Georgia.....	13,085,000
Idaho.....	1,525,000
Illinois.....	7,894,000
Indiana.....	1,880,000
Iowa.....	14,983,000
Kansas.....	10,891,000
Kentucky.....	8,050,000
Louisiana.....	2,668,000
Maine.....	175,000
Maryland.....	400,000
Michigan.....	3,255,000
Minnesota.....	11,855,000
Mississippi.....	5,186,000
Missouri.....	29,885,000
Montana.....	7,767,000
Nebraska.....	14,761,000
Nevada.....	80,000
New Hampshire.....	513,000
New Jersey.....	87,000
New Mexico.....	1,810,000
New York.....	220,000
North Carolina.....	2,583,000
North Dakota.....	17,586,000
Ohio.....	2,665,000
Oklahoma.....	11,751,000
Oregon.....	1,715,000
Pennsylvania.....	6,386,000
South Carolina.....	2,385,000
South Dakota.....	13,692,000
Tennessee.....	8,802,000
Texas.....	18,912,000
Utah.....	610,000
Vermont.....	450,000
Virginia.....	5,088,000
Washington.....	2,085,000
Wisconsin.....	6,558,000
Wyoming.....	3,495,000
Total.....	264,686,000

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as I said in the beginning of my remarks, I have before me approximately 1,000 letters written to me by farmers from the Great Plains area. Of course, naturally, most of them come from the State of North Dakota. My distinguished colleague advises me that most of the letters he has received dealing with REA come from the State of North Dakota. Naturally, the people of our State write to their own Senators on the subject.

Mr. President, during the past summer, no matter where I went in the Great Plains area, at places where the committee held public hearings, when I asked the people what they were most interested in, they did not inquire about the national debt, they did not inquire about the Marshall plan, they did not inquire about tax reduction, but their inquiries dealt with REA. Three or four

hundred or more of those with whom I conversed were women—farmers' wives. They came to me and asked, "When are we going to get REA on our farms? We want a refrigerator. We want to put our meat some place where it will not spoil." Some said, "We want light so that our children when they study at night will not have to read by lamplight." One lady came up to me and said her family was very poor. She said her husband was a cripple and that she was obliged to do the milking in order to help support the family. She said she wanted electric power on her farm so the milking could be done by electric power.

A little while ago my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said that he was extremely interested in the Taft-Hartley law and was going to travel all over the country and regardless of his party, advocate certain amendments to that law. I wish to say, Mr. President, that I am interested in seeing that the men and women in the Great Plains area obtain REA light and power on their farms. After waiting 5 or 6 years, the farmers of the Great Plains area certainly are entitled to the benefit of REA. Certainly appropriations for REA ought not to be cut by our party the way they were last year. The people of that area are entitled to have an appropriation of \$1,000,000,000, as provided by my bill, for the purpose of expanding REA. That amount would not be a gift; it would not be a grant; it would simply be a loan; and the record shows that such loans are being repaid at a more rapid rate than the loans are due.

Mr. President, all I can possibly do so far as REA is concerned is in my feeble, humble way, to keep on bringing to the attention of my colleagues on this side of the aisle the fact that Mr. Wickard says that at least \$1,000,000,000 is needed for the purpose. He did not testify to that directly, because he said the President's budget called for \$300,000,000, but he frankly admitted that \$300,000,000 would not begin to take care of the amount which has been applied for. If Senators will read the exhibit showing the applications by States they will see that much more money has been asked for than is available.

Those who are not in favor of granting such loans will say, "What is the use? The material is not available." We have already subpoenaed the manufacturers of most of this material. Even in the short time since Mr. Wickard gave us the names of the suppliers of the material we have been amazed at the amount of material which has become available. For example, 3 or 4 years ago it was impossible to get poles, but today poles are a drug on the market. One can get all the poles he wants by sending a telegram. Other material is also becoming available at a very rapid rate.

So if this bill passes, I hope that when the Appropriations Committee meets it will approve an appropriation of \$1,000,000,000 for REA. I wish to say that the testimony before the Civil Service Committee showed that when, 2, 3, and 4 years ago, the REA got large appropriations, all it could get, the amount was insufficient to permit the building of a

plant large enough to take care of the business. In one or two instances the testimony showed that the business almost doubled inside of 2 years after the establishment of a plant. Of course, in such cases they now have the additional expense of tearing down the plant they have, or in some instances the expense of adding other units. My distinguished colleague from North Dakota is familiar with the fact that at Grand Forks, N. Dak., where they originally installed three units, within a short time afterward they added three more, even though they had thought the three original units would be ample. After the addition of the second three units, making a total of six, we find them now busily engaged in adding two more units, which will make a total of eight. So we can readily see how important it is, if the farmers in that section of the country are to have light and power on their farms, that sufficient money be made available so that the various cooperatives can get the needed light and power from the Rural Electrification Administration.

I remember, as I am sure my colleague does, an occasion when both of us were the guests of a service club. At that meeting, which was held some years ago, a man who had just been appointed manager of a cooperative invited questions. The manager of the private power company got up and asked him very sarcastically how much power he expected the average farmer to use. He could not answer very well, but finally he said he thought they might use as much as 100 kilowatts a month. The power man laughed at him for saying that. But, Mr. President, within 2 years after it was built, the average farmer there used 247 kilowatts a month, which gives some indication of the tremendous amount of power used on those farms.

Senators would also be surprised to learn the number of machines or motors the average farmer in the Northwest uses. No doubt Senators would think the number would be six or seven. Strangely enough, when the farmer has a modern house—and now most of the houses there are modern—he uses in the neighborhood of 40 motors—which, indeed, is surprising.

All of this shows how the Rural Electrification Administration has grown far beyond the comprehension of even the most enthusiastic advocates of REA a few years ago. In my judgment it also shows a profound reason why every Senator should investigate thoroughly the wants of REA among the farming constituency he represents in the Congress. If Senators do so, I think they will be surprised and amazed at the development which has occurred since 1935, and particularly during the past 5 years.

EXPANSION OF LOW-COST HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, last month, a subcommittee of the joint congressional Committee on Housing held a 1-day hearing in my city of Philadelphia. The subcommittee, I am pleased to say, found near unanimity among the witnesses on the necessity for legislation such as the Wagner-Elender-Taft bill, and particularly for a renewal of Federal

activity in the low-rent slum-clearance field.

There was near, but not complete unanimity, of course, because several spokesmen for real estate maintained that such legislation was not only unnecessary, but if you will, dangerous to the American way, and so forth.

However, the sentiment for decent housing for all our people, as would be made possible under effective long-range-housing legislation such as the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, was so overwhelming that when the Philadelphia Bulletin, a few days later, conducted a public-opinion poll in Philadelphia, it found 92 percent of Philadelphians convinced of the necessity for decent housing for low-income families and 88 percent favoring some form of Government financing to provide it. These poll results prompted the Bulletin to point out editorially that this was a sharp swing from the days, a few short years ago, when the Philadelphia city administration turned down three public-housing projects for which \$18,000,000 of Federal funds were available.

After learning the error of its judgment in that instance and finally agreeing to participate in the Federal low-rent-housing program, the city has since become a great supporter of new legislation to resume and expand the program. Our experience with public housing in Philadelphia, as in most parts of Pennsylvania, has generally been most gratifying.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as part of my remarks, the article from the Philadelphia Bulletin of January 10, 1948, containing the results of the Bulletin poll, and also an editorial from the same edition of the Bulletin commenting on the issues. This editorial says, in part:

The question is not simply whether poor people are entitled to decent housing for their own comfort, so much as whether better-to-do people can afford to allow poorer people to be indecently housed. The toll of crime, disease, and other social ills levied by substandard housing might easily cost more than publicly financed dwellings.

There being no objection, the article and poll were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC HOUSING SENTIMENT

Public opinion in Philadelphia has swung sharply about since the days when City Hall turned down three public housing projects for which \$18,000,000 of Federal funds were available.

This is clearly indicated by the testimony presented at the congressional hearing in this city on Thursday, and by a Bulletin poll, more fully discussed on the opinion page today.

The poll indicates that 92 percent of Philadelphians think housing should be built for low-income families and that of the 92 percent, about 88 percent favor some form of Government financing.

Those who are willing to spend tax funds for such a purpose are doubtless convinced that private enterprise will not and cannot build down to the low incomes and are largely actuated by sympathy for poorly housed families. But there is another consideration, brought out in the decision of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court approving the city's housing authority.

The question is not simply whether poor people are entitled to decent housing for their own comfort, so much as to whether better-to-do people can afford to allow poorer people to be indecently housed. The toll of crime, disease, and other social ills levied by substandard housing might easily cost more than publicly financed dwellings.

THE BULLETIN POLL—92 PERCENT HERE FOR GOVERNMENT ACTION ON LOW-INCOME HOUSING

(By Paul Trescott)

Provision of housing for low-income families was the principal topic discussed at a hearing before a congressional committee here this week.

Witnesses who urged that governmental agencies do something about the situation were speaking what is in the minds of most Philadelphians. Ninety-two percent of the city's adults are in favor of such an undertaking, the Bulletin poll finds.

There is also surprising unanimity on who should provide such housing. Eighty-eight percent of people talked to in a cross section feel it is a responsibility of Government. Thirty-nine percent think it a job for the Federal Government; 14 percent, the State; and 9 percent, the city. Others did not specify beyond the general term "government."

These opinions cut across all political and economic lines, though sentiment for governmental action is higher among low-income people themselves. Even among those with more than average incomes, 85 percent favor governmental action.

Generally the idea of using tax money for this purpose is favored. When asked who should pay for this type of housing, 12 percent said the Federal Government; 7 percent, the State, and 6 percent, the city. Sixteen percent said "government" without specifying which division. Twenty-five percent think the responsibility is on the taxpayers. Thus 66 percent feel that the job should be done by a governmental agency.

Thirty-one percent feel that the cost should be borne by the people who live in the houses. They apparently overlook the fact that low-income people cannot meet the costs at today's prices.

Three percent think such enterprises ought to be financed by private capital; 3 percent said "rich people" should bear the cost, and 8 percent had no opinion. The total is slightly more than 100 percent because some people mentioned more than one governmental division as sharing responsibility.

Oddly, sentiment is highest among the low-income group itself for having the people who live in the housing pay the cost. Sixty-one percent in this group favor use of tax money, 39 percent feel the families should pay the full cost.

In the average-income group, 28 percent would put the cost on the occupants, and 65 percent favor use of tax money.

In the high-income group, 30 percent would put the cost on the tenants, and 70 percent would use taxes.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the contemplated recess of the Senate; but I should like to point out that the other day, in my absence, my very good friend the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] had inserted in the RECORD certain sections from the New York State Power Authority Act, which presumably were in contradiction of a statement I had previously made on the floor of the Senate. As a matter of fact, there is no contradiction whatever. However, I do not wish to make a reply

to the Senator from Wisconsin in his absence. Therefore I shall delay pointing out the inconsistency in that connection until he is able to return. I understand that he is ill.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawing a nomination, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION CONVENTION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report from the Secretary of State, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification I transmit herewith a copy of each of the following instruments signed in the English and French languages at Atlantic City on October 2, 1947, by delegates of the United States of America and by delegates of certain other countries represented at the International Telecommunication Conference and the International Radio Conference, Atlantic City, 1947:

- (1) International telecommunication convention, with annexes;
- (2) Final protocol to the convention; and
- (3) Radio regulations annexed to the convention, with appendices.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report which the Secretary of State has addressed to me in regard to this matter, together with (1) the volume, enclosed therewith, containing the texts of the instruments above-mentioned and of other acts of the Atlantic City conferences, and (2) an excerpt from the report of the delegations of the United States to those conferences.

In the event that the Senate advises and consents to ratification of the convention, final protocol, and radio regulations, it is requested that the Senate do so with the understanding that such ratification will be subject to the declarations which were made by the delegates of the United States in signing the convention and which are set forth in the final protocol to the convention, namely:

"Signature of this convention for and in the name of the United States of America constitutes, in accordance with its constitutional processes, signature also on behalf of all territories of the United States of America.

"The United States of America formally declares that the United States of America does not, by signature of this convention on its behalf, accept any obligation in respect of the Telegraph Regulations, the Telephone Regulations, or the Additional Radio Regulations referred to in article 13 of the Atlantic City convention."

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 17, 1948.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) volume containing texts of: (a) international telecommunication con-

vention, with annexes, Atlantic City, October 2, 1947; (b) final protocol to the convention; (c) radio regulations annexed to the convention, with appendixes; (d) other acts of the Atlantic City conferences; (3) excerpt from report of United States delegations to Atlantic City conferences.)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 12, 1948.

The President,
The White House:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to their transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a copy each of (1) the international telecommunication convention, (2) the final protocol to the convention, and (3) the radio regulations annexed to the convention, signed in the English and French languages at Atlantic City on October 2, 1947, by delegates of the United States of America and by delegates of certain other countries represented at the International Telecommunication Conference and the International Radio Conference, Atlantic City, 1947.

Accompanying the convention, and a part thereof, are five numbered annexes. Annex 1 is a list of countries, territories, and groups of territories. Annex 2 contains definitions of terms used in the convention. Annex 3 contains additional provisions relating to arbitration. Annex 4 consists of general regulations, including general provisions regarding conferences (pt. I) and provisions regarding international consultative committees (pt. II). Annex 5 contains the text of an agreement between the United Nations and the International Telecommunication Union.

Accompanying the radio regulations, and a part thereof, are 16 numbered and 3 lettered appendixes.

The texts of the instruments mentioned above are contained in a single volume, enclosed herewith, published by the existing International Telecommunication Union, which furnished the international secretariat for the Atlantic City conferences. Included in the same volume are the texts also of the following documents, which do not require action with a view to ratification on the part of the United States, namely:

- (1) Additional protocols to the international telecommunication convention, 1947;
- (2) Resolutions, recommendations, and opinions adopted at the International Telecommunication Conference;
- (3) Additional radio regulations;
- (4) Additional protocol to the acts of the International Radio Conference; and
- (5) Recommendations and resolutions adopted by the International Radio Conference.

The International Telecommunication Conference met at Atlantic City from July 2 to October 2, 1947, inclusive, for the purpose of formulating a convention to revise or replace the international telecommunication convention which was signed at Madrid on December 9, 1932. The Madrid convention was transmitted to the Senate on January 27, 1934 (Senate Executive B, 73d Cong., 2d sess.) and, after ratification, entered into force with respect to the United States on June 12, 1934 (49 Stat., pt. 2, 2391).

The International Radio Conference met at Atlantic City from May 16 to October 2, 1947, inclusive, for the purpose principally of revising the general radio regulations (Cairo Revision, 1938) annexed to the Madrid convention of 1932. The Cairo radio regulations were transmitted to the Senate on January 27, 1939 (Senate Executive B, 76th Cong., 1st sess.) and, after approval, entered into force with respect to the United States on August 25, 1939 (54 Stat., pt. 2, 1417).

The telecommunication (plenipotentiary) conference was convened as a result of an invitation issued by the Government of the United States through its diplomatic missions and through the Bureau of the International Telecommunication Union at Bern, Switzerland. The arrangements for the radio conference were made subsequently. Details with respect to the convening of the conferences were decided upon as a result of a preliminary telecommunication conference held in Moscow, September to October 1946, between representatives of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, France, and China. The Atlantic City conferences, in formulating a new convention and new regulations, took into consideration technical developments in the telecommunication field during recent years and also developments in the field of international organization.

The convention drawn up by the telecommunication conference contains provisions relating to telecommunication generally and certain special provisions relating to radio. An outstanding feature of the convention is the reorganization of the International Telecommunication Union in such a way that it may be brought into close relationship with the United Nations on a footing similar to that of other specialized organizations related to the United Nations. Article 26 of the convention, together with annex 5, deals with the relation between the Union and the United Nations.

The comprehensive radio regulations drawn up by the Atlantic City radio conference and adopted by the plenipotentiary conference, as an annex to the convention, are designed to modernize the uniform international rules with respect to radio and make them more responsive to scientific developments and technical improvements in the field.

It will be noted that annex 1 to the convention lists 78 countries, territories, or groups of territories which, upon the entry into force of the convention, will become or will be entitled to become separate members of the International Telecommunication Union, with voting and other rights incident to such membership. The delegates of certain governments signed the convention, as well as other documents related thereto, separately for one or more of the territorial possessions of their respective governments. Although "Territories of the United States of America" are listed separately from the United States of America, so that under article 1 of the convention those Territories, as a group, may be treated as a separate member, there was no separate signature on behalf of those Territories. In order to make the situation with respect to United States Territories entirely clear, the delegates of the United States, in signing the convention, made the following declaration, which is set forth in the final protocol to the convention:

"Signature of this convention for and in the name of the United States of America constitutes, in accordance with its constitutional processes, signature also on behalf of all Territories of the United States of America."

It will be observed also that article 13 of the convention states that the provisions of the convention are completed by four sets of administrative regulations, namely, telegraph regulations, telephone regulations, radio regulations, and additional radio regulations. In paragraph 3 of article 13 it is provided that "These regulations shall be binding on all members and associate members." The telegraph and telephone regulations were not drawn up at the Atlantic City conferences. This will be done at subsequent administrative conferences at which inter-

ested governments will be represented. The United States is not at present a party to the telegraph or telephone regulations adopted at Cairo in 1938, or previously, nor did the United States delegates sign the additional radio regulations which were adopted by the Atlantic City radio conference. Inasmuch as those three sets of regulations relate either to matters of particular concern only to the European region or to matters with respect to which the United States Government has not undertaken to adopt extensive regulatory measures, it is the policy of this Government not to accept any obligation under any of those regulations, at least for the time being. Accordingly, the delegation of the United States at Atlantic City reserved the position of this Government by making the following declaration, incorporated in the final protocol to the convention, as a condition to the signing of the convention on behalf of the United States:

"The United States of America formally declares that the United States of America does not, by signature of this convention on its behalf, accept any obligation in respect of the telegraph regulations, the telephone regulations, or the additional radio regulations referred to in article 13 of the Atlantic City convention."

If future conferences should amend those regulations so as to enable the United States Government to become a party to any or all of them, consideration will be given to changing the existing policy of this Government with respect thereto.

Under the provisions of article 23 of the convention, the convention and the radio regulations annexed thereto will, upon entry into force, abrogate and replace, in relations between the contracting governments, the international telecommunication convention signed at Madrid on December 9, 1932, as well as the Cairo radio regulations of 1938.

It is provided in article 49 of the convention that the convention shall enter into force on January 1, 1949, between countries, territories, or groups of territories in respect of which instruments of ratification or accession have been deposited before that date.

It is believed that the convention and radio regulations drawn up and signed at Atlantic City constitute a notable improvement over the existing convention and regulations which have for their purpose the international allocation of radio channels, the regulation of the use of those channels, and the bringing into effect of many other provisions governing the international regulation of telecommunication, particularly of radio.

A more detailed explanation of the purposes and provisions of the convention and its annexes, and of the radio regulations, is set forth in a comprehensive report of the delegations of the United States to the Atlantic City conferences. An excerpt from that report, comprising the major part of the concluding chapter thereof (summary and conclusions), is enclosed herewith.

Respectfully submitted,

G. C. MARSHALL.

(Enclosures: (1) Volume containing texts of: (a) international telecommunication convention, with annexes, Atlantic City, October 2, 1947; (b) final protocol to the convention; (c) radio regulations annexed to the convention, with appendixes; (d) other acts of the Atlantic City conferences; (2) excerpt from report of United States delegations to Atlantic City conferences.)

Mr. VANDENBERG. In connection with the treaties which were just laid down by the Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed therefrom.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Maj. Gen. James Alward Van Fleet, O3847, United States Army, for appointment as Director, Joint United States Military Advisory and Planning Group in Greece, with the rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947;

Maj. Gen. Hubert Reilly Harmon, Air Force of the United States (colonel, U. S. Air Force), for appointment to the position of senior Air Force member of the Military and Naval Staff Committee of the United Nations, with the rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947;

Rear Adm. Oscar C. Badger, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Commander Naval Forces, Western Pacific;

Rear Adm. Cato D. Glover, Jr., United States Navy, for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy;

Rear Adm. Henry R. Oster, United States Navy, for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy;

Rear Adm. Edwin D. Foster, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to be Paymaster General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years;

Alfred H. Noble and Graves B. Erskine, for appointment to the permanent grade of major general in the Marine Corps;

Edward A. Craig and Thomas J. Cushman, for appointment to the permanent grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps;

Brig. Gen. Edwin Bowman Lyon and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Air Force;

Brig. Gen. Frank Allen, Illinois National Guard, and several other officers, for appointment in the National Guard of the United States of the Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. Erik Henning Nelson and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Air Force Reserve of the Air Force of the United States; and

Maj. Gen. William E. Kepner and sundry other officers for appointment in the United States Air Force.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider now the nominations approved by the Armed Services Committee of officers in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps below the rank of general and admiral.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to see the names. There is one nomination to which I should like to object.

Mr. GURNEY. Those to which I refer are all below the rank of general. If the Senator would like to see the names, we shall have to put them on the calendar. That would cost about \$100.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask that the list of officers of the rank of colonel and below be presently considered and approved.

There being no objection, the legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of officers in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, below the rank of general and admiral.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask that the President be notified immediately of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmations.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 18, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received February 17 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Leonard N. Caswell, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service staff officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

Edward W. Mill, of Maryland, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons, under the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 16, 1947 (Public Law 36, 80th Cong.), for appointment in the Regular Army in the Army Nurse Corps and the Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the grade specified, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to provisions of the mentioned act. These officers have been selected to fill existing vacancies in the grades for which they are nominated and appointments in these grades will not act to exceed the number of positions authorized for such grades.

To be captains

Vida L. Buehler, WMSC (PT), M622.
Mary C. Burnham, WMSC (Diet.), R64.
Elizabeth S. Carlross, WMSC (Diet.), R230.
Mildred S. Carter, WMSC (PT), M863.
Mary L. Gill, WMSC (Diet.), R5.
Norine O. Ginder, WMSC (OT).
Frances M. Horr, WMSC (Diet.), R828.
Alice T. A. Knox, WMSC (Diet.), R405.
Katharine Leonard, WMSC (PT), M2027.
Erma G. Lord, WMSC (Diet.), R321.
Hilda M. Lovett, WMSC (Diet.), R187.
Alene V. Ness, WMSC (Diet.), R339.
Helena D. Quinn, WMSC (Diet.), R593.
Winifred G. Riley, WMSC (Diet.), R1212.
Barbara M. Sledson, WMSC (Diet.), R949.
Mary E. Stack, WMSC (Diet.), R38.
Carol Stange, WMSC (PT), M531.
Ruth G. Strain, WMSC (Diet.), R2088.
Ethel M. Theilmann, WMSC (PT), M460.
Helen Tremback, WMSC (Diet.), R979.
Anita V. Williams, WMSC (PT), M535.

To be first lieutenants

Melba L. Adams, ANC, N771698.
Mary L. Albright, ANC, N789901.
Johanna M. Anderson, ANC, N731898.
Juliet M. D. Anton, ANC, N802148.
Agnes M. Arrington, ANC, N726659.
Elizabeth A. Askegaard, ANC, N788336.
Margaret F. Bagar, ANC, N728398.
Doris L. Bailey, ANC, N786733.
Marjorie L. Baker, ANC, N772000.
Geraldine R. Baldwin, ANC, N760237.
Adele M. Ball, ANC, N789676.

Dorothy E. Baltzo, ANC, N784126.
Wilma R. Barney, ANC, N775440.
C. Barbara Bean, ANC, N721466.
Evelyn M. Bedard, ANC, N720427.
Angela R. Benda, ANC, N784722.
Clara R. Bentley, ANC, N720756.
M. Pauline Bettinger, WMSC (OT).
Loretta M. Bevins, ANC, N794837.
Jean B. Bissonette, ANC, N790444.
Louise F. Bitter, ANC, N773854.
Inez H. Blossman, ANC, N726541.
Martha M. Boger, WMSC (PT), M2727.
Ada E. Boone, ANC, N732743.
Thelma K. Bormann, ANC, N726975.
Olive J. Boxa, ANC, N776818.
Ruth E. Breneman, ANC, N759187.
Esther Brians, ANC, N780513.
Gertrude E. Brooks, ANC, N722932.
Marjorie T. Brown, ANC, N744819.
Billie E. Bryson, ANC, N762021.
Martha M. Cameron, ANC, N722922.
Virginia A. Cameron, ANC, N759820.
Margaret H. Cannoles, ANC, N742035.
Helen M. Carbonneau, ANC, N772969.
Virginia L. Carroll, ANC, N720454.
Mary J. Carsey, ANC, N787729.
Constance G. Catalano, ANC, N741941.
Jennie L. Caylor, ANC, N726132.
Hazel C. Chadwick, ANC, N726119.
Christine M. Chesnik, ANC, N736102.
Jeannette E. Churchill, ANC, N786215.
Leota H. Clark, ANC, N729407.
Mary E. Clark, ANC, N724179.
Mary S. Clark, ANC, N726643.
Ethel Claxon, ANC, N752639.
Flora L. Clymer, ANC, N759930.
Belle K. Cohen, WMSC (PT), M2370.
Betty L. Colyer, ANC, N724172.
Dora M. Coover, ANC, N724992.
Lena J. Cricco, ANC, N785419.
Patricia L. Crocker, ANC, N735222.
Doris J. Crouser, WMSC (OT).
Dorothy M. Cunningham, ANC, N729141.
Florine H. Cutts, ANC, N765103.
Alice B. Davidson, ANC, N725697.
Robertine E. Davies, ANC, N798122.
Elizabeth M. Dean, WMSC (Diet.), R422.
Dorothy M. DeHart, ANC, N759415.
Elaine H. Deliman, ANC, N724821.
Helen C. Dembeck, ANC, N722152.
Janet L. Demy, ANC, N725226.
Anna T. DeNegri, WMSC (Diet.), R2041.
Maryelle Dodds, WMSC (OT).
Marion M. Donaldson, WMSC (Diet.), R631.
Madelyn P. Donnelly, ANC, N757021.
Kathryn T. Driscoll, ANC, N720119.
Rita R. Dulisse, ANC, N725362.
Rose J. Dull, ANC, N729450.
Cleop. E. Durkee, ANC, N730881.
Colatone Dyas, ANC, N723265.
Julia C. Eastwood, ANC, N753091.
Virginia H. Echerd, ANC, N730508.
Anna M. Evans, ANC, N723512.
Hazel L. Evans, ANC, N755894.
Anna E. Fairley, ANC, N783060.
Mary C. Fanning, WMSC (Diet.), R2281.
Maxine H. Fell, ANC, N767108.
Miriam J. Fickes, ANC, N757275.
Wanda I. Fill, ANC, N736675.
Jane C. Flanagan, WMSC (PT), M1137.
Edythe M. Fleck, ANC, N755327.
Dorothea V. Fleischer, WMSC (PT), M563.
Margaret C. Flynn, ANC, N725781.
Evelyn Folmar, WMSC (Diet.), R2077.
Eunice M. Ford, ANC, N764478.
Marguerite W. Foster, ANC, N725815.
Emily K. Fralley, ANC, N724095.
Catherine E. Francis, ANC, N743694.
Miriam E. Fuller, ANC, N720722.
Anna D. Funk, ANC, N761151.
Mildred M. Furlong, ANC, N759162.
Ruth E. Fussell, ANC, N726548.
Gladys L. Fusselman, ANC, N760079.
Margaret L. Gattis, ANC, N764474.
Sara J. Gephart, ANC, N737582.
Phyllis M. Gervais, ANC, N752024.
Elnora L. Geyer, ANC, N769890.
Pattie R. Gibbs, ANC, N765371.
Willie C. Gilliam, ANC, N784600.

- Katherine S. Gillies, ANC, N762639.
 Sheila M. Gillman, ANC, N773523.
 Margaret Gist, ANC, N779655.
 Agnes C. Glunt, ANC, N759163.
 Joyce Goodwin, ANC, N726073.
 Eleanor M. Gorman, ANC, N755806.
 Patricia Greenan, ANC, N772512.
 Catherine R. Grogan, ANC, N734478.
 Emma C. Groh, ANC, N762516.
 Mary E. Guerdette, ANC, N789020.
 Marjorie A. Haley, ANC, N760485.
 Anna D. Harkins, ANC, N735673.
 Paulanna R. Harkins, ANC, N779193.
 Cleo S. Harrod, ANC, N771895.
 Willie E. Hart, ANC, N763526.
 Mary E. Hartley, ANC, N721426.
 Mary B. Hartman, ANC, N774339.
 Lillian E. Haws, ANC, N759648.
 Sally C. Hayes, ANC, N761194.
 Bernice I. Heath, ANC, N729084.
 Margith H. Heide, ANC, N722417.
 Marie A. Heine, ANC, N742916.
 Dorothy A. Helwig, ANC, N795496.
 Evelyn M. Henrich, ANC, N755816.
 Alice P. Hill, ANC, N774437.
 Katherine J. Hills, ANC, N790802.
 Phyllis J. Hocking, ANC, N771542.
 Maralee R. Hodgson, ANC, N728947.
 Ann E. Hogan, ANC, N722849.
 Bernice E. Holsinger, ANC, N767680.
 Helen C. Hooverson, ANC, N731053.
 Margaret L. Hornberger, ANC, N728257.
 Elizabeth R. Horne, ANC, N726247.
 Marjorie O. Horton, ANC, N735651.
 Lucy E. Houghton, ANC, N788544.
 Matilda Howard, ANC, N789757.
 Vivian Howell, ANC, N724882.
 June L. Hudson, ANC, N778660.
 Agnes T. Hulme, ANC, N720678.
 Barbara M. Hutchins, ANC, N788207.
 Elizabeth J. Ingram, ANC, N741073.
 Sallie H. Ingram, ANC, N724754.
 Agnes M. Jackson, ANC, N772126.
 Florence S. Jacobs, ANC, N720864.
 Margaret L. Jacobson, ANC, N725016.
 Dorothy E. Jaeger, ANC, N755478.
 Johanna H. Jakubaitis, ANC, N760896.
 Helen C. Jansen, ANC, N777001.
 Alice C. Jeffreys, ANC, N703064.
 Lillian Jones, ANC, N726570.
 Mildred C. Katich, ANC, N728676.
 Mary E. Keefe, ANC, N752502.
 Lelia M. Kehoe, ANC, N725054.
 Arlene E. Kind, ANC, N733944.
 Eleanor A. Kiensch, ANC, N726060.
 Helen S. Kloss, ANC, N756348.
 Gladys N. Knowles, ANC, N764912.
 Rita M. Kopp, ANC, N758553.
 Ethel R. Kovach, ANC, N730729.
 Helen S. Kozlowski, ANC, N769900.
 Bernice H. Kress, ANC, N768608.
 Ruth B. Krieser, ANC, N789491.
 Ruth A. Kruger, ANC, N725969.
 Lucile Krumperman, ANC, N737175.
 Blanche F. Kuchar, ANC, N731218.
 Katherine R. Kurutz, ANC, N759067.
 Helen M. Landis, ANC, N728163.
 Anna M. Lanzendorfer, ANC, N762858.
 Theresa J. Larivee, ANC, N753297.
 Caryl R. Lawrence, ANC, N772502.
 Mary Lawrence, ANC, N744651.
 Marietta Levy, ANC, N783433.
 Minalie M. Lindo, ANC, N789245.
 Lulu M. Lines, ANC, N774506.
 Irene Lionais, ANC, N757761.
 Josephine A. Lo Cicero, ANC, N726238.
 Esther M. Lockwood, ANC, N741953.
 Martha E. Lohman, ANC, N796858.
 Agnes B. Lohrmann, ANC, N777858.
 Imelda H. Lohrmann, ANC, N777857.
 Lela M. Lovelace, ANC, N734455.
 Hazel J. Lovett, ANC, N726691.
 Etta M. Lowe, ANC, N735094.
 Mary S. Lowe, WMSC (Diet.), R2010.
 Eddie R. Loyd, ANC, N790657.
 Mary E. Lynch, ANC, N760412.
 Mary K. Lynch, ANC, N772944.
 Patty J. Mann, ANC, N764504.
 Angelena I. Mariano, ANC, N720502.
 Alice S. Marks, ANC, N76005.
- Helen M. Martin, ANC, N793020.
 Coletta M. Masterson, ANC, N770171.
 Kathryn Maurice, WMSC (OT).
 Christine Maxwell, ANC, N790026.
 Kathryn J. McCann, ANC, N723269.
 Dorothea M. McCarty, ANC, N764523.
 Helen A. McCloskey, ANC, N793287.
 Mercedes A. McCort, ANC, N759212.
 Agnes B. McGann, ANC, N724392.
 Eleanore McIntyre, ANC, N737514.
 Catharine G. McNiven, ANC, N756757.
 Mary V. Menold, ANC, N771066.
 Catherine A. Merat, ANC, N761009.
 Charlotte M. Meyer, ANC, N77736.
 Florence J. Mikowski, ANC, N772671.
 Esther M. Miller, ANC, N783972.
 Kathleen F. Miller, ANC, N727294.
 Mae E. Miller, ANC, N761726.
 Anne D. Mitchell, WMSC (PT), M2749.
 Hannah T. Mohr, ANC, N771221.
 Mary A. Moles, ANC, N720283.
 Esther J. Moran, ANC, N733612.
 Marion M. Morris, ANC, N737978.
 Ida B. Morrison, ANC, N780166.
 Mary E. Morse, ANC, N776188.
 Mary F. Morse, ANC, N765624.
 Dorothy H. Murray, ANC, N722172.
 Rowella H. Newell, ANC, N764641.
 Charlotte L. Nolan, ANC, N774428.
 Irene B. Norkus, ANC, N731889.
 Walburga G. Nyez, ANC, N743871.
 Evelyn R. Ordway, ANC, N721468.
 Margaret L. Ormand, ANC, N724115.
 Naomi I. Osborne, ANC, N728081.
 Estat C. Ott, ANC, N726780.
 Mary E. Oulmet, ANC, N752757.
 Jewell A. Outlaw, ANC, N764549.
 Reverdy M. Overbey, ANC, N775252.
 Susie W. Page, ANC, N785743.
 Margaret T. Paolilli, ANC, N720840.
 Joline D. Parente, ANC, N799645.
 Alice S. Patterson, ANC, N734763.
 Isabel S. Paulson, ANC, N729977.
 Irene M. Pawlowski, ANC, N730407.
 Mildred M. Peace, ANC, N758647.
 Mildred Perkins, ANC, N729065.
 Lorraine W. Pertelt, WMSC (Diet.), R2066.
 Mabel E. Pierce, WMSC (OT).
 Carrie E. Pittman, ANC, N764243.
 Alice E. Planty, ANC, N793112.
 Mary K. Platt, ANC, N763188.
 Audrae A. Quintini, ANC, N745074.
 Constance H. Ramsey, WMSC (PT), M962.
 Margaret E. Remington, ANC, N788713.
 Ellen A. Respini, ANC, N736933.
 Bertha D. Richardson, ANC, N743348.
 Catherine M. Riney, ANC, N767238.
 Sue H. Robertson, ANC, N759874.
 Pauline Robinson, ANC, N726362.
 Alta F. Rogers, ANC, N768075.
 Mary M. Rollins, ANC, N722039.
 Lucille I. Ross, ANC, N773779.
 Dorothy L. Rundel, ANC, N736981.
 Georgeann E. Russell, ANC, N790663.
 Helen A. Rydzewski, ANC, N755886.
 Juanita H. Scalf, ANC, N726954.
 Sophia M. Schadt, ANC, N790361.
 Eleanora M. M. Scheessele, ANC, N729804.
 Mary M. Schultz, ANC, N725459.
 Martha J. Seidel, ANC, N725585.
 Mildred M. Shaner, ANC, N732112.
 Clarice J. Shannon, ANC, N798040.
 Evelyn E. Silbert, ANC, N744703.
 Martha A. Simpkins, ANC, N741645.
 Blanche I. Sipple, ANC, N724645.
 Betty F. Smith, ANC, N780195.
 Frances K. Smith, ANC, N737762.
 Mary E. Smith, ANC, N787430.
 Ruth G. Smith, ANC, N726026.
 Gloria E. Snyder, ANC, N790425.
 Anna M. Solberg, ANC, N730696.
 Eleanore M. Soppa, ANC, N783524.
 Venice Spendlove, ANC, N737232.
 Julia Stark, ANC, N734413.
 Edna L. Staton, ANC, N726433.
 Sylvia M. Stivlen, ANC, N788155.
 Pauline Stokes, ANC, N72429.
 Sarah C. Stradley, ANC, N764473.
 Cecilia A. Sulkowski, ANC, N787128.
 Mary L. Sutton, ANC, N779191.
- Marion D. Sweigart, ANC, N760482.
 Garnet A. Sykes, ANC, N759856.
 Bernice V. Taylor, ANC, N732298.
 Georgia V. Teater, ANC, N734020.
 Lois R. Thompson, WMSC (PT), M2509.
 Mae Thompson, ANC, N729960.
 Margaret J. Thornton, WMSC (Diet.), R138.
 Sara M. Tippet, ANC, N759208.
 Annie Townsley, ANC, N798846.
 Helen L. Tucker, ANC, N732614.
 Ruth E. Tucker, ANC, N743800.
 Vida J. Tucker, ANC, N779401.
 Florence E. Turney, ANC, N771281.
 Louise Tyner, ANC, N787989.
 Edith E. Uhl, ANC, N777113.
 Gladys M. Webster, ANC, N734474.
 Nell O. Welborne, ANC, N727083.
 Harriet H. Werley, ANC, N704033.
 Ida A. Werner, ANC, N734303.
 Margaret E. Wesely, ANC, N775434.
 Martha M. West, ANC, N753050.
 Alta M. White, ANC, N727186.
 Agnes L. Williams, ANC, N765017.
 Rebecca S. Williams, ANC, N769374.
 Sarah L. Williford, ANC, N763111.
 Gladys H. Wilson, ANC, N727098.
 Fleeta O. Worthington, ANC, N779091.
 Elizabeth A. Wright, ANC, N724532.
 Frances E. Wright, ANC, N734957.
 Doris Yopp, ANC, N763926.
 Elizabeth A. Zettel, ANC, N768464.
 Anne M. Zizon, ANC, N731197.
 Delores V. Zuelke, ANC, N773566.

To be second lieutenants

- Frances Aragon, ANC, N777498.
 Audrey P. Atkinson, ANC, N780113.
 Dorothy R. Bonsall, ANC, N780364.
 Gladys I. Breault, ANC, N788737.
 Mary M. Breunig, ANC, N794927.
 Opal T. Cameron, ANC, N765697.
 Erin E. Cannon, ANC, N765130.
 Claire D. Cardinal, ANC, N754703.
 Anna G. Casey, WMSC (PT), M2433.
 Olga L. Chernak, ANC, N800020.
 Muriel E. Clapper, ANC, N769588.
 Helen S. Comac, ANC, N797645.
 Catherine N. Cotsones, ANC, N795714.
 Therese E. Daley, ANC, N792055.
 Dolores A. Damberger, ANC, N786801.
 Grace M. Dickson, WMSC (OT).
 Muriel E. Eckelberg, ANC, N774891.
 Janice W. Feagin, ANC, N765051.
 Rose M. Ferrelli, ANC, N754249.
 Mary E. Feters, ANC, N769169.
 Enola S. Flowers, WMSC (PT), M2606.
 Bertha G. Goodfellow, ANC, N765256.
 Phyllis A. Hall, ANC, N785546.
 Myra J. Hanlon, ANC, N769298.
 Katharine Henningsen, WMSC (OT).
 Marian Horner, ANC, N800157.
 Ethel M. Inglis, ANC, N797863.
 Margaret M. Kish, ANC, N799732.
 Frances C. Knipe, ANC, N797666.
 Marilouise Knott, WMSC (PT), M2829.
 Marybelle J. Lacey, ANC, N778213.
 Amalia R. Lazaro, ANC, N799218.
 Ruth M. Leahy, ANC, N792053.
 Mabel D. Lewis, ANC, N801141.
 Catherine M. Loeffel, ANC, N792044.
 Beulahs Masterson, ANC, N779874.
 Maxine Miller, ANC, N778015.
 Catherine E. Paigant, ANC, N798920.
 Ruth M. Pray, WMSC (OT).
 Bernadette L. Reider, ANC, N794941.
 Mildred E. Schapiro, WI SC (PT), M2776.
 Marie J. Schmahl, ANC, N765858.
 Kathryn E. Schultz, WMSC (OT).
 Virginia M. Shaffer, ANC, N792066.
 Marian F. Sindoni, ANC, N802051.
 Roberta W. Smith, ANC, N792050.
 Artrude M. Stark, ANC, N774454.
 Marilyn C. Stevens, ANC, N796359.
 Phyllis R. Strobel, WMSC (PT), M2777.
 Harriet Ter Borg, ANC, N774576.
 Jane M. Valine, ANC, N801126.
 Alma E. V. Wallsten, ANC, N797242.
 Rosemary Witt, ANC, N770107.
 Harriet L. Wood, WMSC (PT), M2766.
 Donna P. Zimmerman, WMSC (Diet.), R2403.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 17 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

IN THE ARMY

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major

Leo Murphy

To be first lieutenants

Ralph Gunther Tross
Richard Holt Dolson
Leland Boyd Fair
Joseph Daniel Hughes
John Thomas McAtee
Clarence Ames Martin, Jr.
Francis Lester Wycoff
Durell Benner Hartman
Luther Leon Halbrook
Lawrence Edward Spellman
Richard Edwin Cross
Joseph Aaron Goldes
Robert Arnott Cady
Norman Maynard Stephens
John Hamilton Burke
Raymond Preston Davis
Gilbert Harry Amis
William Paul Hartman
William Thornton Coburn
William Carlton Wilkinson
Richard Henry Kelly
Harold Elwin Maier
Alvin Carl Jensen
John Christian Wallman
Milton Max Nemky
Willard Almur Dodge
Robert Burnham Brewer

Medical Corps

To be lieutenant colonels

Paul Herbert Martin
Otto Leonard Churney
Richard Barr Jones
Francis Patrick Kintz
Augustus Alonzo Hall
Frank Eric Hagman

To be majors

Richard Irving Crone
George Augustine Goder
John Randolph Hall, Jr.
Lucio Ernest Gatto
David Harry Naimark
Aniello Francis Mastellone
William Leroy Vogt
Raymond Taylor Jenkins
Carl Bennett Stilson
Robert Nathan Lehman
Louis Franklin Saylor
Raymond Bender Croissant
Jon Olafur Stefan Sigurdsson
John Warren Guerin
George N. Schuhmann
Alonzo Allan Towner, Jr.
Wilbur Dwight Dice
Ralph Everett Reiner
Joseph Robert Vivas
William Nelson Donovan
Norman Clemm Veale

To be captains

Clarence Blake Hewitt
Byron Landt Miller
Carl Barry Weller
James Barnes Hartgering
Zbigniew John Baczewski
Wayne Robert Oelhafen
Charles Walter Metz, Jr.
Richard Earl Mardis
Robert Blair Franklin

Dental Corps

To be lieutenant colonels

George Emil Naselli
Wallace Jacob Morlock

To be majors

William Ralph Thomas Oakes
Benjamin Lee Brooks, Jr.
Arthur Hastings Vollertsen
Donald William Grove

Charles Stewart Jones
William Joseph McAllister
Theodore Emmett Fischer
Gerald Arthur McCracken
Douglas Monroe Beebe
Kenneth David Eye
Virgil Gordon Walker
Jack Menefee Messner
Hal David Oakley, Jr.

To be captain

John Everett Gaynor

Veterinary Corps

To be lieutenant colonel

Arvo Theodore Thompson

To be majors

Don L. Deane
Don Lee Mace
Howard Curtis Maxey
Karl Harry Willers
Manuel Charles Kastner
Harry Ruyle Lancaster

To be captains

William Gordon Brooks
Samuel Garwood Forester
Elmer Richard Pede

Medical Service Corps

To be first lieutenants

Robert Newell Gilliam
Robert Isaiah Anderson

Army Nurse Corps

To be lieutenant colonels

Kathleen Mitchell
Margaret Elizabeth Aaron
Jeanette Blech
Florence I. Lee
Nora G. Freeman

To be first lieutenants

Velma Fay Grove
Anna Veronica Michelitsch
Geraldine Massingill
Keitha Pauline Zeisloft
Mary Ann Strauss
Nancy Carol Leftenant
Barbara L. Hughson

Women's Medical Specialist Corps

To be first lieutenants

Margaret A. Kraybill
Melna Adams Farmer
Katherine Cecelia Ehrhart

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

PROMOTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

To be first lieutenants

Daniel Joseph Boyle
Patrick Henry Kenny, Jr.
Bruce Wendell Pope
James Allen Burton
Joseph Brice Moore
DeForrest August von Laufer, Jr.
Mark Carlyle Noble
Armand Edouard Reiser
Raymond Adolph Groh
Julian Daniel Shofner
Arthur John Ulrich
Russell Perrine Morris, Jr.
Carl Wilford Tipton
James Theodore Seymour
Roy Enright Guy
Lester T. Kearney, Jr.
Jack Byron Owens
Julian Franklin Berry
Donald Keith MacGregor
Russell Millward Heller, Jr.
Edward Frank Holst, Jr.
Hubert Neil Skidmore
Robert Francis Watson
Jacob Milton Freeman
Henry Leo Rauch
John William Menard
Newell Dwight Mitchell
Dempsey Ernest Ballard
Claude Merrill Trawick, Jr.
Francis Eris Wilkie
John Raymond Kern, Jr.
Harry Holt Moreland
Charles Francis Hoy, Jr.

Conrad John Lindemann
John Scales Hardwick
James Marshall Anderson
Doyle Dean Dickson
Richard David Klingenberg
Walter Thomas Gentile
Charles Richard Croft, Jr.
Warren L. Simpson
William Francis Ramsey
John A. Saffell, Jr.
Bruce Ward Carr
Warren Glenn Van Houten
Leroy Peter Zotter
Hollie Alonzo Wilkes

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE SUPPLY CORPS OF THE NAVY

Lieutenant

Warren, James A.

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Grad, Charles F. Dura, Leon J.
Lewis, Harvey E. Rawis, Elbert S., Jr.
Aicken, John E.

Ensigns

Damon, Stewart W. Haley, Robert S.
Evans, Robert A., Jr. O'Brien, Richard J.
Hediger, Fritz H.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Ensign in the Navy from June 4, 1948

Andrew Roman

Ensigns in the Navy from June 4, 1948, in lieu of appointment as ensign in the Supply Corps

Warren W. Barker Wedo Nutaitis
Raymond A. Marston Theodore W. Pstrak

Ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from June 4, 1948

John D. Shaw
Richard M. Hennigan

Lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy

Dwight H. Smith
Dennis P. McCarty
Francis Marshall

Ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy

James C. Billings, Jr. Henry A. L. Church
Norman D. Chetlin Lawrence R. Eades

Ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy

Robert E. Dickman
Edward L. MacCordy

Lieutenant (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy

Myers Thornton

Ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy

Anne M. Bailey	Valeria Kalembe
Ann M. Bono	Emma R. Partridge
Margaret Bozdos	Edna J. Rundell
Margaret M. Cook	Mary E. Staud
Hazel C. Crouse	Flora B. Sturm
Wanda M. Crouse	Hollyce J. Trantham
Alyeene L. Emfinger	Ethel C. A. Eusebio
Lols J. Gallagher	Eleanor G. Hall
Jcsephine L. Hart	Dorothea M. Johnston
Virginia M. Huff	Maria Poljanac

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy:

Lieutenant (junior grade)

William H. Martin, Jr.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Commander

Frank F. Wildebush

Lieutenant commander

John D. Boland

Lieutenants (junior grade)

John P. Ahearn Albert E. Thielen
Arthur A. Helgeson Harry A. Underwood
Francis E. Hornbrook William J. Weller

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, in lieu of lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct spelling of names:

Halim G. Habib
James M. Keirnan
Joseph E. F. Rankin

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant (junior grade)

John E. McGraw

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenants

Charles E. Payne
Lloyd W. Wolford

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Philip H. Dunham Roy C. Lininger
Joseph O. Kuebel, Jr. Edward A. Smith
Joseph T. Kuschell Wayne C. Whitehead

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant commander

Jasper E. Morgan

Lieutenant

Arthur L. Hall

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenants

Lillian T. Buytaert Marjorie H. Johnson
Anne T. Cooley Marie E. Poulin
Patricia E. George

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Bertha M. Davis Vera M. Joyce
Cecilia C. Flannery Bertha E. Rollings
Ruth E. Hartley Ellen Williams

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Gladys LaV. P. Kennedy to the grade indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, in lieu of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct spelling of name:

Ensigns

Corinne A. Fischer
Melanie Ince
Eleanora W. Rennock

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from June 4, 1948:

Robert P. Armstrong	Benjamin W. Martin
Rex R. Berglund	William T. Mitchell,
Eugene Bezore	Jr.
Richard C. Boyd	Beverly R. Molony
John M. Brozena	Clarence E. Parker, Jr.
Donald A. Cook	Patrick D. Rotramel
Murray C. Cook	Don LeR. Southworth
George D. Cryan	John P. Sundberg
Arnold F. Deichelman	Charles E. Waring, Jr.
Lawrence H. Dickens	Peter A. Williams
Delmar H. Evans, Jr.	Stanley Williams
Edward V. Fineran	Robert D. Wilroy
Emerson P. Kendall	

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from June 4, 1948:

Lowry M. Miller
John G. Wissler

George D. Tracy to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy.

Robert W. Radcliffe to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

John W. Murdock
Robert P. Woodworth

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Willis J. Allender	May E. Knudson
Elizabeth G. Anderson	Bertha A. Krumming
Vivian Blasingame	Patricia R. Laisure
Marie M. Boatman	June L. Lunde
Ambia L. Buckner	Katherine A. Massey
Anna V. Bush	Elaine J. Matthews
Sarah V. Callebs	Estelle Morrison
Patricia M. Doherty	Frances K. Oliver
Dorothy L. Gero	Anna M. Reed
Josephine M. Glod	Adah D. Sander
Elsa A. Griswold	Jane E. Steinbrink
Melba L. Haggerty	Juanita J. Strayhorn
Eileen M. Hubbell	Shirley A. Zuelke
Catharine B. Jones	

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant commander

LeRoy E. Wibbe

Lieutenants

John T. Egan, Jr.
Paul H. Pettit

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Robert E. Baker	Lewis G. Richards, Jr.
Raymond L. Bradley,	George F. Sager
Jr.	Myron E. Samuelson
Robert J. Evoy	Julius H. Spence
James H. Lee, Jr.	James I. Thorn
John R. Lindsay	Theodore H. Wilson,
Lyle D. Litton	Jr.
Harry S. McGaughey	Clayton E. Wood
William S. Markham	

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant

Robert M. Kehoe

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant commanders

Gwenn M. Loomer
Clare C. Marshall

Lieutenants

Arthur C. Boughton
Miles W. Cheatham, Jr.
James G. Rogers, Jr.

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Edwin "R" Black	Wilbur R. McKibben
Harold S. Dexter, Jr.	Jack W. Robinson
Loren F. Enke	Vincent R. Van
Ira Goldstein	Eenenaam
Chester S. McCoy	

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenants

Paul R. Kent
Ralph B. Lopez
Ralph L. Vasa

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant

Noma V. Foster

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Loretta F. Bielecki
Mary E. Kelly

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of colonel in the Marine Corps:

Raymond E. Hopper	John M. Davis
William P. Battell	Walfried H. Fromhold
Cornelius P. Van Ness	James T. Wilbur
Edson L. Lyman	Charles H. Hayes
George H. Cloud	Donald M. Weller
Charles E. Shepard, Jr.	Edward A. Montgomery
Peter A. McDonald	Edgar O. Price
Thomas B. Hughes	Robert E. Hill
William B. McKean	James M. Daly
Fred D. Beans	Ronald D. Salmon
Wallace M. Greene, Jr.	Russell Lloyd
Paul W. Russell	Ernest W. Fry, Jr.
Frank M. Reinecke	

The following-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of colonel in the Marine Corps:

August Larson

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

William R. Williams	Guy B. Smith, Jr.
William F. Harris	Fred J. Klingenhagen
Gordon D. Gayle	Clyde T. Smith
James D. McBrayer, Jr.	Wilbur F. Meyerhoff
Jack Hawkins	Carl J. Cagle
James B. Glennon, Jr.	John A. Burns
William A. Stiles	Francis C. Claggett
Edwin C. Aiken	William G. Muller, Jr.
Russell Duncan	Benjamin B.
Richard M. Huizenga	Manchester III
George M. Lhamon	Frank E. Gallagher, Jr.
William A. Cloman, Jr.	Robert C. McDonough
Alfred N. Gordon	Boyd O. Whitney
Alfred F. Robertshaw	Richard D. Strickler
Jino J. D'Alessandro	Frederick R. Findtner
Henry J. Revane	James W. Keene
Melvin D. Henderson	John F. Kinney
Elliott B. Robertson	Michael Dobervich
Chester A. Henry, Jr.	Robert F. Jenkins, Jr.
Sidney F. Jenkins	Lewis A. Jones
George F. Guber	Norman E. Sparling
John D. Howard	Julian V. Lyon
Fred T. Bishopp	Carl M. Longley
Cecil W. Shuler	Francis W. Benson
Glenn R. Long	George R. Stallings
Samuel D. Mandeville,	William J. McKennan
Jr.	LeRoy P. Hunt, Jr.
William G. Thrash	Claude S. Sanders, Jr.
Louis Metzger	William R. Dorr, Jr.
Luther R. Seibert	Henry E. W. Barnes
Wendell H. Best	Walter H. Stephens
John I. Williamson, Jr.	Clarence R. Schwenke
Robert S. Riddell	John F. Mallard
George T. Fowler	George B. Thomas
Warner T. Bigger	Henry J. Smart
Charles A. Rigaud	John E. Rentsch
Roger S. Bruford	Charles T. Hodges
Randall L. Stallings	Kenneth H. Black
Edwin C. Godbold	William C. Humbert
Warren P. Baker	Robert R. Burns
James Taul	Marion E. Carl
Homer E. Hire	Charles W. Somers, Jr.
George V. Hanna, Jr.	Arthur H. Adams
Richard Quigley	Angus M. Fraser
Royce W. Coln	Robert Hall
Henry S. Massie	Ralph M. Wismer
Alfred T. Greene	Donald J. Robinson
Melville M. Menefee	Alfred M. Mahoney
Wayne M. Cargill	Robert M. Hanna
James B. Moore	Erik W. Ritzau
Louis L. Frank	Earl W. Gardner
Joseph W. Kean, Jr.	John C. Brewer
Theodore F. Beeman	William D. Morgan
Wyatt B. Carneal, Jr.	William E. Clasen
William C. Kellum	"J" Frank Cole
Richard K. Schmidt	Lowell S. Reeve
Thomas V. Murto, Jr.	Homer G. Hutch-
Morris E. Flater	inson, Jr.
Frank H. Collins	Allen H. Anderson
Albert H. Potter	Glenn L. Todd
Gordon A. Hardwick	Elkin S. Dew
Lyman D. Spurlock	Erwin F. Wann, Jr.
Howard E. King	Otis V. Calhoun, Jr.
Waite W. Worden	Talbot F. Collins
James R. Anderson	John H. Partridge
Lee A. Christoffersen	Frederick J. Karch
Deryle N. Seely	Lawrence F. Fox
Harold S. Rolse	Horace H. Figuers
Roger C. Power, Jr.	Joseph S. Skoczylas
Hoyt U. Bookhart, Jr.	Gerald G. Williams
Albert F. Moe	John W. A. Antonelli
Martin W. Storm	Edwin C. Kimball
John E. Morris	George W. Herring
Randolph S. D.	David C. Wolfe
Lockwood	Edward V.
Robert D. Heintz, Jr.	Mendenhall, Jr.

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Frederick Belton
John G. Johnson

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps Reserve:

Harold A. Strong

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Thomas B. Tighe
Bert Davis, Jr.
Robert W. Nelson
Hugh J. Irish
Thomas M. Leineweber
Thell H. Fisher
Daniel H. Davis
James L. Fawley, Jr.
Henry Matsinger
John E. King
James H. Naylor
Thomas T. Grady
William W. Curtis
Carl O. Grussendorf
Bertli E. Larson
Arthur L. Adams
George P. Wolf, Jr.
Franklin C. Bacon
Webster R. Hood
Robert W. Anderson
Vernon L. Bartram
Robert B. Neville
Howard F. Stevenson
George Codrea
Thomas C. Dutton
James A. Pounds III
Karl G. Palmer
Robert R. Fairburn
Robert B. McBroom
Charles A. Lipot
Walter E. Reynolds, Jr.
George J. Debell
Donald B. Otterson
James G. Juett
William E. Baugh
Drew J. Barrett, Jr.
Harry B. Smith
Robert L. Cochran
Charles D. Barrett, Jr.
Gerard T. Armitage
Frank J. Clarke
William A. Murphy
James F. Lawrence, Jr.
Walter J. K. Hon, Jr.
James A. Moriarty, Jr.
Jerrold O. Cote
Marshall R. Pilcher
James H. Crutchfield
Madison C. Whiteside
Orvin H. Ramlo
Cruger L. Bright
William J. Sims
George D. Wolverson
Thomas W. Furlow
Herbert A. Peters
Howard L. Walter
Leo F. Tatro, Jr.
Samuel Richards, Jr.
Matt S. Ober, Jr.
George L. Hollowell
Jack Cosley
Samuel B. Folsom, Jr.
Conrad G. Winter
Philip W. Kelly
Robert G. Howie
Richard L. Nickerson
Walter R. Bartosh
William E. Crowe
Robert R. Ayres, Jr.
Jack L. Brushert
George M. Dawes
Thomas A. Heaton
Arthur F. O'Keefe
William B. Freeman
Sidney L. Groff
Wallace G. Wethe
Thomas H. Mann, Jr.
Kenneth D. Frazier
Arvid W. Blackmun
John L. Mahon
Homer S. Hill
Elmer P. Thompson, Jr.
Louis F. Ferguson
Lawrence W. Smith, Jr.

Richard J. Flynn, Jr.
Willard C. Lemke
Carroll E. McCullah
Robert R. Read
Clarence H. Moore
Gordon E. Gray
Arthur N. Nehf, Jr.
Russell L. Janson
Martin B. Roush
Lawrence L. Herzog
Harry F. Schwetzel
James E. Johnson
Frank P. Barker, Jr.
Vance F. McKean
Richard H. Pierce
Charles E. Kollmann
Milton M. Cook, Jr.
Howard E. Cook
Lowell D. Grow
William L. G. Hughes
Jack B. Winters
Henry W. Horst
Carol D. Dalton
James E. Grubbs
Francis X. Witt, Jr.
Wallace J. Slappey, Jr.
William P. Dukes
John D. Noble
Roy R. Hewitt
John G. Babashanian
Gale W. Roberts
Jay E. McDonald
Harlen E. Hood
Joseph F. Wagner, Jr.
Scott G. Gier
James A. Etheridge
Robert D. Bachtel
Billie K. Shaw
James P. Wilson
Richard W. Schutt
Henry V. Joslin
Daniel J. Regan
Lyle K. London
Robert H. Daley
Harry A. Hadd
Floyd M. Johnson, Jr.
Richard M. Elliott
John C. Lundrigan
Victor J. Barringer
George S. Saussey, Jr.
Alexander S. Walker, Jr.
Ashby J. Fristoe
Paul D. Parker
Henry G. Gatlin, Jr.
Carl W. Hoffman
Robert R. Weir
Edward L. Bale, Jr.
Edward K. Pedersen
John W. Beebe
Robert K. Dahl
John C. Landrum
Robert L. Thomas
Dean S. Hartley, Jr.
Grant W. McCombs
William G. Johnson
Harold F. Brown
George B. Herlihy
Robert L. Conrad
William P. Mitchell
Robert F. Conley
Walter T. Warren
William D. Patterson, Jr.
Floyd C. Kirkpatrick
Ralph C. Rosacker
Harry C. Dees
Richard W. Batdorf
James W. Hendrick
Robert J. Bolish
Kenneth C. Greenough
Robert E. Brown

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Willis R. Lucius
Theodore A. Petras

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

John D. Case
Robert S. Stubbs II
Benjamin S. Read
Frederick A. Quint
Carl L. Hill
John S. Canton
Richard M. Giddens
Reverdy M. Hall
Edward O. Alsip
Edmund K. Griswold
Joseph P. Cushing
John D. Fair
Edward S. Fris
Harry B. Persinger, Jr.
Robert Baird
James W. Baker
Thomas H. Miller, Jr.
Frank C. Lang
Monroe E. McNeil
Ronald L. Bruce
John S. Parrott, Jr.
William J. Wachslar
Thomas R. O'Dell, Jr.
Robert M. Keim
Glenn L. Rieder
Laurel M. Mickelson
Edward R. Agnew, Jr.
William G. Dair, Jr.
James M. McGrew
Kenneth L. Moos
Theodore R. Yachik
John C. Donovan
George E. McClane
Chester R. Harris
John K. Sinderholm, Jr.
Alton F. Vergote
Charles B. Chambers
Wilbur G. Patton
William E. Greiner, Jr.
Benjamin G. Martin
George Nasif
James R. Martin
Frank J. Faureck
William R. Earney
Garth K. Sturdevan
William E. Melby
William M. Streeter
Peter A. Tonnema, Jr.
Robert E. Dawson
Robert D. Thurston
James B. Ord, Jr.
Charles F. McKiever
James T. Pearce
William A. Kerr
John B. Harney
Don E. Wegley
Lester E. Veigel
Charles C. Cresap
Clarence E. Corley, Jr.
Robert F. Seward
Victor A. Kleber, Jr.
Kenneth T. Whitescarver, Jr.
Harold E. Smith
Vincent J. Smith
Robert C. Lehnert
John H. Glenn, Jr.
Harry A. Stahlstrom
Earl W. Johnson
Robert J. Barbour
Roland E. Marker
Robert J. Lynch, Jr.
Edward B. Winston
John W. Muldoon, Jr.
Rudolph L. Bittman
Victor A. Armstrong
David G. Johnson
Richard S. Rash
Robert M. Marshall
Robert L. Lamar

Albert G. Schoneberger
Herbert P. Mosca, Jr.
Royce W. Watson
Donald I. McKamy
Zaphney O. Humphreys
Ray T. Lemmons
Roy S. Bachstein
Donald S. Thornbury
George F. Lewis
Herbert E. Roser
Wilford L. Stone
Robert W. Lowe
Gordon A. Kroodsmas
William E. Mack
Jess Thierry, Jr.
Gerald J. Tice
George M. Bryant
Arnold L. Emils
Ralph A. Soderberg
Charles D. Fredrick
Calvin C. Crum
Melvin J. Flannagan
"J" "P" Nixon
Eugene W. Nelson
James A. Harper
Charles H. Church, Jr.
Carl W. Lindell
Edwin H. Finlayson
Thomas J. Burnam
Manning T. Jannell
Loren K. Bronleewe
William R. Nowadnick
George W. Brewer
Harold J. Eiland
Warren G. Hopkins
Thomas J. Ross
John E. Barnett
Alfred W. King
Donald L. Fenton
Harland E. Troy
Vernon J. Peebles
Rex Wilson
William L. Devinney
Jesse V. Booker
Floyd W. Earnest
Harry R. Moore
Nathan B. Peevey, Jr.
Francis C. Jennings
William M. Crapo, Jr.
Basil T. Idler
Herbert G. Manning, Jr.
John A. Gibson, Jr.
Donald T. Doxey
Fred C. Houser
James C. Stanfield
George E. Kelly
Frank G. Parks
John J. Richards
Stephen Shervais
Clifford D. Miller
William J. Wagner
Joseph E. Davies
Johnny D. Lindley
Robert L. Dominick
Edwin L. Hickman, Jr.
Charles C. Samis
William E. Brandon
Richard A. Bjorson
Joseph L. Freitas, Jr.
Harry E. Leland, Jr.
Walter E. Ottmer
John P. Roden
Myron E. Wilcox, Jr.
John Lomac
William H. Cowper
Frederick A. Vernon
Elwood H. Potter
Harvey M. Patton

John E. Hansen
Robert D. Limberg
Elwood D. Bush
Victor E. Allen
Earle E. Bagnall
John E. Vanhousen
Lynn W. Griffiths
Valdemar Schmidt, Jr.
William H. Livingston
Robert D. Janssen
David Cleeland
Paul N. Storaasli
Michael D. Harvath
Clifford P. Blankenship
James T. Cotton
Earl B. Sumerlin, Jr.
Reuel H. Pletz
Joel L. Neuman
John H. Lavoy
William E. Zimmer
Andrew L. McVicar
Emilius R. Clampa, Jr.
Robert J. Lesak
Lee B. Swindall
James C. Jewell
Arthur P. Wilson, Jr.
Walter S. Metzger
Nathaniel H. Carver

James A. Blakely, Jr.
Edward F. Danowitz
Walter M. Atherton
Ross M. MacAskill
Vincent J. Robinson
James R. Poe
Frank J. Hubka
John H. Wagner
Leonard A. Lemback
James A. Gallo, Jr.
Elmer A. Anderson, Jr.
Albert A. Black
Leslie L. Page
Edward I. Lupton
Mervin B. Porter
William R. Van Ness
Thomas J. Bardon
Charles C. Schwartz
William M. Derby, Jr.
John R. Gill
Bruce A. Goewey
James A. Dorsey
James Payette
Lawrence P. Hart
Francis C. Buxton
Edwin J. Mika
Ernest A. Buford, Jr.
Robert Sabot
Roy L. Reed

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

James W. Tuma
Thomas H. Cutler
Good Burleson
Arthur A. Compton
James D. Swinson
Allen F. Stockdale
Richard W. Sinclair
Donald L. Shenaut
Edwin M. Clements
Max C. Taylor
Mainerd A. Sorensen
John E. Bugary
Ray M. Burrill
Reginald M. George
William A. Willett
Albert F. Rinehart
Fernand A. Landry
William T. Smith
Victor E. Sellers
Judson Vanderhoof
Donald W. Houston
Frederick V. Osborn
Alexander Gagy
Jerome Hieronymus

Chester H. Fritts
Elwood E. Gebhart
Thomas C. Palmer, Jr.
Herman T. Barbee
Paul F. Brandenburg
Stanley P. Bulkowski
William G. Reid
Robert J. Corbett
Paul Kerns
John Gerey
Henry F. Camper
Fred R. Philpot
Arthur C. Fix
James E. Brown
Alfred M. Jones, Jr.
Charlie H. McGee, Jr.
Walter L. Simpson
Charles O. Diliberto
Edward E. Burt
Albert J. Assad
Wilbur C. Conley
Vernon L. Hendley
Anthony J. Roscoe

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate February 17 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

POSTMASTER

Richard B. Miller to be postmaster at Rushville in the State of Indiana.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most loving Father, whose mercy is over all, we rejoice that in Thy presence there is fullness of joy and at Thy right hand there are pleasures forevermore. As Thou hast committed unto us a service essential to all that is good and great in the being of man, teach us to sow seeds of brotherly consideration and justice to all men and to wait patiently for the fruitage of our labors. We pray Thee to help us to be brave enough to accept